

The Reformed Church Review

Volume 2

APRIL, 1923

Number 2

I

A SYMPOSIUM ON RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Editorial Note: These articles on Religious Education were prepared for a Conference on Religious Education in the Reformed Church, held in Philadelphia in November, 1922. The aim of the conference was "to consider, in all its phases, the problem of Religious Education, as related to our Reformed Church, and to formulate a constructive policy and program of Religious Education." The meeting was attended by representatives of the Commission of General Synod on Moral and Religious Education, of the Theological Seminaries, Colleges, and Academies, of the Publication and Sunday School Board, the Boards of Home and Foreign Missions, and of the Women's Missionary Society of General Synod. This conference claimed no official authority of any kind. It was called, under the insistent pressure of the problem of Religious Education that is being felt in the schools and councils of all the churches, in the hope that out of it will grow practical measures for the unification, articulation, and promotion of Religious Education in the Reformed Church. A similar hope now moves the Editors of the REVIEW to print in this issue the papers which formed the basis for the discussions of the conference. They touch many aspects of the problem but they agree on certain fundamental questions relating to the general problem. The chairman of the conference was instructed to formulate these findings, and his report is printed as a general introduction to the papers. The Editors believe that this Symposium on Religious Education

is most timely because it raises one of the vital issues that will engage the attention of General Synod at its next triennial session in May, 1923.

I. THE MEANING OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

THEODORE F. HERMAN

The two dominant problems of the Christian Church in our age are the social significance of redemption from sin and Christian Education. Both are old problems. From the very beginning the Church recognized certain social implications of her divine mission, and exercised her educational function. But their full meaning has been made known to us gradually and progressively, as the Spirit of God has taken the things of Christ and has shown them to us. To-day, each of the two is seen in a new light; and the intimate organic relations of both are being discerned. If the supreme mission of the Church of Christ is the establishment of the Kingdom of God, then Christian Education is the normal method for the accomplishment of this redemptive mission.

What, then, do we mean by Christian Education? That question is pertinent because false and defective conceptions of Christian Education may easily lead to hostile attitudes on the part of groups and individuals who are sincerely devoted to the propagation of the gospel of Christ, or they may result in perfunctory schemes of religious education which ignore the primary fact that the Christian religion is a life that cannot be taught, but must be caught.

Let us affirm, then, first and foremost, that the Christian religion is the life of God in the soul of man, which is quickened in those who through Jesus Christ find access to God and live in personal communion with Him. The God of the Christian revelation, therefore, is both its ground and its goal, its cause and its consummation. In

the past this supreme fact, that the Christian religion is a divine life engendered in man by the Spirit of God, has frequently been totally ignored in certain theories of religious education, or has been very inadequately expressed in them. Dogmatists have assumed that religion is primarily a system of supernatural information which may be taught; ritualists have regarded religion as a set of divinely commanded ceremonies; moralists have reduced it to a sum of ethical precepts. Now doctrines, rites, and precepts may indeed be taught, in the sense of being imposed upon men by some external authority; and they *do* belong to the Christian religion as essential aspects of its expression in terms of thought and life. But they must be regarded as the inevitable consequence of religion, and not as its creative cause.

Hence, when we speak of Christian Education, we do not mean the impartation of doctrinal knowledge merely, nor the performance of sacred rites, nor the inculcation of moral precepts. We find ourselves in hearty agreement with those who affirm that "religion cannot be taught, but must be caught."

But we are constrained, further, to ask, How, then, is religion caught? That, really, is the great issue before the Church to-day. There can be no division of opinion among Christian people on the question whether religion is education or regeneration, whether it is something imposed upon man from without by educational processes or quickened within the soul of man by the divine spirit. But there may well be divergent views, even among Christian people, on the question how the Spirit of God works in man. Does religion catch a man unawares? Is it a sudden seizure, from without and from above, that puts the soul under its divine constraint? Does the Spirit of God thus lead men to conversion and decision?

In the past, the Reformed Church has been divinely led, in theory and practice, to affirm that there is a more organic

and normal method of operation by the Spirit of God. Without presuming to set dogmatic metes and bounds to the free motion of God's love, without attempting to limit the wideness of His mercy by our narrow channels, we have, nevertheless, been devoted to the catechetical method of teaching and training children for efficient membership in the Church, accepting all the theological implications and practical corollaries of that method.

Now Christian Education, as we understand it, marks no violent break with our history and traditions, as an educational church. On the contrary, it denotes an effort to widen and deepen our past practices. It means, that in our methods we make full use of all the new insight into the nature and constitution of man which the science of psychology has given us. It means, that in planning the content of Christian Education we bring within its scope the complex social life of the present day. It means, that in defining the ultimate purpose of Christian Education we stress training for the Kingdom of God, rather than membership in a church.

Christian Education, thus conceived, means the gradual and progressive growth into the way of life and truth revealed by Jesus Christ. And it may be defined as a method of training the young into efficient devotion to the Kingdom of God. It assumes that there is one thing men cannot, and need not, do, viz., to create or quicken in the soul of man the germ of religion. That God alone can do, and He has done it. But it also assumes that there is one thing man must do, under God, viz., to provide the conditions for the normal and fruitful growth and development of that divinely implanted germ. And, hitherto, we have failed to do that adequately. Even as in the realm of nature God provides seed and sun, and demands of the husbandman that he till the soil and, thus, promote the growth of the seed,—so it is in the realm of the Spirit. God implants in the soul of every child that which no human skill

or toil can produce. It is like a seed, charged with infinite potentialities of good and evil. And Christian Education is spiritual husbandry. It means creating the conditions under which the seed within the soul may reach its maturity. It means not merely to teach the young to know the will of God, as revealed in the gospel, but to enable them to grow into the doing of it, in their human relationships, from birth to maturity. It includes the impartation of the knowledge of God's revelation in Jesus Christ, the formation of fixed habits and definite Christian attitudes toward life, and the inculcation of the spirit of intelligent loyalty to Christ as the Savior and Master of mankind, and of efficient devotion to the extension of God's kingdom as the supreme purpose of life.

It is evident that such a conception of the purpose and scope of Christian Education involves a program of coöperative action running into the far future. It is not a task that can be assigned to the pulpit, or performed in the Church schools, or delegated to the home. It must rest upon a social basis broad enough to include, at least, home, school, and church. It requires the earnest and intelligent coöperation of parent, teacher, and preacher. Nothing less than that will enable us to establish an educative process that will result in the growth of the young into efficient members of the Kingdom of God. And much more than that may be required if we are ever to establish a social order, so impregnated with the spirit of Christ in its thought and life, that within it the young will grow normally into the grace and truth of God.

Christian Education, so conceived, is not concerned primarily with better methods or with educational equipment. These technical aspects of the problem are, indeed, of great importance, but they are not paramount. The real problem of Christian Education is the creation of a life, within the educational institutions, viz., the home, the school, and the church, under whose constant pressure and

control the young may grow into a religious life. Life always means two things, viz., experience and experiment. And the Christian life means, first, the experience of the love of God, and then, a growing participation in the purposes of that divine love. And Christian Education aims at the creation of such conditions in the home, the school, and the church, that the young, through direct personal fellowship with parents, teachers, and preachers, shall experience the love of God in their unfolding lives; and, further, that within these social institutions they will find opportunities for sharing and expressing that divine love. Then, out of this rich subsoil of all real life, out of personal experience and active experiment, there will grow Christian convictions and fixed habits (mental and moral attitudes toward life). And thus a faith will be born in them, that is not merely belief in a religion that has been taught authoritatively, but a faith in Jesus Christ as Savior and in Christianity as the way of salvation that is the result of personal experience.

We do not indulge the fond illusion, then, that the creation of a Board of Christian Education by the General Synod will solve the problem of Christian Education in the Reformed Church. But we hail the establishment of this new administrative agency as an indication of the fact that our church, rich in its educational heritage and traditions, is wide awake to the paramountcy of the problem of Christian Education, and is resolved, under the guidance of the Spirit of God, to go forward toward an adequate solution as fast as it may, in the light of a growing experience, and as far as it must, in order to achieve its aim.

It is for the General Synod's new Board of Christian Education to determine the direction and the speed of its operations. But it may be proper to call attention in this statement to the two central factors of the problem of Christian Education, viz., the teacher and the pupil. By the teacher we mean the adults in home, school, and church,

who must create the conditions required for the growth of the young into a genuine Christian life. By the pupil we mean the young, from infancy to maturity, who are to be trained and taught.

Thus the problem of Christian Education has two major aspects. It means, first, to train persons for educational leadership, to provide parents, teachers, and preachers who understand the problem and are fitted, through training, to aid in its solution. This aspect of the problem points unmistakably toward the academies, colleges, and seminaries of the church. There, we must meet the urgent need of educational leadership. And that is, perhaps, the one definite thing the new Board can do immediately. It can be of immense service in promoting real Christian Education in the higher institutions of our church.

The second aspect of the problem is even more important, because it concerns the child, whom Jesus placed into our midst as being "the greatest." Here, of course, the problem of Christian Education comes to its focus. Christian Education, as we have seen, denotes a method of teaching and training the young. It means their growth into Christ's way of being and of living. For their sake we want parents, teachers, and preachers,—that in home, school, and church, "conservation of the children" through educative processes, may supplant "reclamation of adults" by revivalistic methods.

This second aspect of the problem, then, points directly to the Church-schools and to the home. In our homes and schools the young tarry while we train and fit them for life. There, during the plastic years of infancy and childhood, we may determine whose image and superscription they shall bear through life. There, inevitably, they grow into some kind of life. They choose a way of being and living that has assumed definite form, if not rigid fixity, by the time they reach adolescence. And there, in home and school, Christian Education must seize its God-given op-

portunity to make the life of the young a progressive growth into an efficient devotion to the Kingdom of God. We stress the great need of educational leadership because we need men and women of vision and consecration; adults who are spiritually fitted and technically trained for the Christian education of the young.

This second aspect of the problem, then, centering in home and school, raises all the detailed questions of providing an adequate and efficient Christian Education for our children and youths,—questions of curricula and texts, of methods and standards, of equipment and organization, of training and administration. And it seems clear that the organic and intimate relation of the two major aspects of Christian Education demands their correlation under the guidance and control of one administrative body. Only thus, it would seem, can we achieve unity in aim and efficiency in method. The twain are one in spirit and aim, and they cannot be held in permanent divorcement, without serious loss.

Ultimately, therefore, this new Board of Christian Education, in its administrative functions, should become the focal point where all the diverging lines of Christian Education, running through the fabric of our denominational life, are concentrated; and the seminal centre, whence inspiration and definite guidance flow to all phases and aspects of Christian Education. But it seems clear that such a consummation cannot safely be reached by summary ecclesiastical action. It must come, rather, as the result of an organic evolution in the course of a growing experience.

Various practical difficulties are obvious. What, *e.g.*, will be the precise relation of this Board to the higher institutions of learning in our church? At present, they are all under synodic control. And, without constitutional amendment, no Board of General Synod could exercise any authority over them. At most, therefore, the new Board of Christian Education can sustain only advisory relations

to our academies, colleges, and seminaries. Such a relation, of course, opens up the widest field of usefulness to the Board, but it must be clearly understood from its very birth.

It is conceivable that the relation of this Board to the local church, in its educational activities, should be quite different. There, indeed, it might function most beneficially as an administrative body in the widest sense. But here, also, practical difficulties exist. At present the Publication and Sunday School Board occupies that field, though not exclusively. Other agencies within the local church, and other Boards of the church perform distinctively educational tasks. What, now, will be the relation of the new Board of Christian Education to the Publication and Sunday School Board?

Manifestly, the new Board faces a great task. We have every confidence that its personnel will consist of men and women of vision and consecration. Gradually they will show us the way to a unified system of Christian Education. And if the church will follow whither they lead us, we shall, in time, raise up an army that will be mighty in their efficient and mature consecration to the love of God manifested in Jesus Christ, and in their personal devotion to the redemptive purpose of God revealed to us in the gospel.

2. THE COMMISSION OF GENERAL SYNOD ON MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

C. E. CREITZ

The Education Commission of the Reformed Church in the United States was created by the General Synod held at Reading, Pa., in 1920. Among the reasons advanced for the creation of such a commission were the following:

"To secure a more uniform policy in things educational, to study conditions and ascertain the needs of the whole Church and throughout the whole Church, for the promo-

tion of certain interests of our institutions which can be done more economically and efficiently together than separately, to obtain a larger measure of aid and inspiration from the activities of other denominations doing the same work and to have representation and participation in 'The Council of Church Boards of Education in the U. S. A.'"

The Commission took up at once the study of itself, to discover, if possible, whether it could perform the functions which seemed to be vaguely in the mind of the Church. From this study it appeared inevitable that a Board of Education must replace the Commission on Education as speedily as possible, if the educational interests of the denomination are to be properly served, and the Commission began to plan at once to urge on the entire Church the importance of ratifying the new article to the Constitution, authorizing the creation of such a Board. This article was approved by the almost unanimous action of the Classes, and it is therefore probable that a Board of Education will be elected at the next meeting of the General Synod. Should this be the case, the Commission on Education will only have a temporary existence, and will serve only as the means of leading the Church into an ampler and richer provision for our educational interests.

In the mean time the Commission has devoted itself to the study of what such a Board of Education can and should do and to the stimulation of interest in religious education throughout the Church.

The following are among the interests and activities which a Board of Education should promote:

1. *Finances.*—Such a Board must itself be adequately financed. It must have the means for employing an adequate staff of workers. These would not need to be many to begin with; but a General Secretary with an office would be absolutely essential, and no amount of aversion to the creation of new offices should prevent the Church from the appointment or election of an educational secretary, if a

Board is created. Here lies one of the fatal weaknesses of a Commission. It has no funds for adequately performing the task which should be done in behalf of the education of our Church.

Such a Board of Education could receive legacies, and apportionments, and private contributions, and so eventually get into the position where it could render financial assistance where it was needed. This is already done by some denominations. The Board of the Southern Baptist Convention is giving special aid to weak institutions in five states and establishes new schools that are needed in pioneer sections. Such a Board might have saved Wichita to the Church in the Middle West.

2. *Standards.*—The standards of our schools are a vital concern to the whole church. Here is a phase of our educational institutions where a Board could help greatly by kindly advice and oversight. Frequent surveys of the Schools could be made and thus a body of valuable data be secured. The Board could be a clearing house for all information regarding our schools and could disseminate this information.

Church Schools should be Christian. The denomination is interested in the subject matter taught and in the character of the teachers. Is the Bible taught in all our schools and to what extent? What is the moral tone of the schools? Parents who send boys and girls to these schools have a right to know. Without meddling or giving offense a Board could become a tonic in helping to build up and maintain proper standards for our schools.

3. *Reformed Schools for Reformed Youth.*—The boys and girls of our Church should be gotten into our own schools as far as possible. The advantage of this for the young people themselves, for our schools, and for our congregations and for the denomination should be self evident. Many of our young people will of course always be going to other schools because of convenience of location

or lessened expense, just as those of other denominations will come to our own schools for the same reasons. But there are no doubt hundreds of our young people who go to other schools, who might just as easily have been secured for our own, and this type of student often comes from just the kind of a home whose interest in our Church Schools should be secured. This is a matter of great importance and someone should look after it definitely and follow it up throughout the whole Church.

It may be suggested that the schools hunt out their own men. This they are doing, but each school can speak only for itself, and it may not be able to offer what the youth needs. The pastor can and as a rule will help if he is jogged up in the matter and has in his hands the definite information about our schools that is needed. The Board could prepare a hand book that would give information about all our schools that would make it possible to give intelligent guidance to our young people. Other Boards are already doing this.

The Southern Baptists have had a campaign to challenge young people to go to College. Pastors are urged to send at least one boy to a Baptist school. The names of those graduating from High Schools were secured, and literature was sent to them showing the immense value of higher education for life, livelihood, and equipment for service in Church and state. In the short history of their Board, they have developed a fine literature on this subject and are using it wisely.

In the effort to secure students, young people will be found who ought to go to College, but who have no funds. Various Boards come to the rescue in such cases with Loan Funds. The Congregational Educational Society "provides grants or scholarships for more than 100 students each year."

The Presbyterian Church in the U. S. (South) assists about 300 students each year from their Loan Fund.

Manifestly a Board of Education in our Church would have a fine chance for service along similar lines.

4. *Religious Supervision.*—Reformed students in tax-supported institutions have received practically no attention from the Church. The importance of this work can be seen by what other churches are doing. The Congregational Society maintains pastoral work in 12 state institutions; the Northern Baptist Board in 17 large universities; and the Presbyterian North in 35 tax-supported institutions, etc. That the importance of this form of work is recognized in our own Church is indicated by the following action of the Home Mission Board at its annual meeting in July: "On motion it was voted that the whole question of students in State Institutions be referred to the Educational Commission of the General Synod." There are but few colleges or schools perhaps where it would be possible for our Church to have pastors. But part-time pastoral oversight could be arranged for. These students could, through home pastors, be practically all listed, and they could be kept in touch with in the name of the Church and the Kingdom.

5. *Life-Service.*—To secure life service of young men and women for the Gospel ministry, for missionary, teaching, and distinctively Kingdom callings is the most outstanding need of the whole Church to-day. Without trained and consecrated leadership, no amount of money will suffice. And this leadership can be secured, not by spasmodic and occasional appeals for life service, but by a systematic, persistent still hunt up and down the Church; judicious challenging of young people, personally and by correspondence and literature at proper intervals, in an unending campaign through the years, will alone, under God, secure the leadership which will be adequate to the Church's need. This challenge should come to every student in the schools, that those who are really fitted may have an opportunity to respond.

As one scans the activities of the various Boards of Education, the outstanding feature is "recruiting candidates for the ministry and missions and Christian leadership callings," by means of life-work conferences, literature, etc. in the academies, colleges and universities of the land. Such effort is sure to be rewarded when done judiciously.

Here is a promising opportunity for a College pastor of the right sort. A striking illustration of what he can do is seen in the case of the "University of California at Berkeley. In a period of 50 years, 12,700 were graduated, and only 47 of them became clergymen. Then came a pastor for the Presbyterian students, and in 5 years, 40 students have gone into the Presbyterian ministry; 12 are now in preparation for the seminary; 30 have gone into the foreign field, and there are 40 students pledged for foreign missions."

6. *Interest in Education.* "To create a denomination-wide interest in Christian education and the schools of the Church," that is the way one Board states its prime objective. Every other board and agency is dependent on this, and will lag unless this interest is magnified. We of the Reformed Church who stress educational religion should not be laggards here.

These are some of the ways in which a Board of Education could function in our Church. The scope of such a Board could no doubt be greatly expanded; covering ultimately the whole subject of religious education.

The inadequacy of a Commission on Education is shown by the fact that it cannot enter aggressively into any one of the functions outlined above. The Commission has only endeavored to serve as a guide into something larger and better. It has kept the subject before the Synods and Classes, has secured the appointment of an Education Day by all the Synods annually, has communicated information and offered such help as lay in its power to the heads of our educational institutions, and offered suggestions to

pastors for the proper observance of Educational Day, took an active part in urging on the Classes the approval of the article to the Constitution authorizing this creation of a Board of Education, and is now of the firm conviction that such a Board alone can cope with the difficult, but tremendously important, subject of Christian Education in the Reformed Church.

READING, PA.

3. THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AS IT RELATES ITSELF TO THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

GEORGE STIBITZ

In the letter requesting a paper for this conference, the writer of the letter said, "Unless we can do something very definite and that right soon, to put religious education into our college curriculum, the very slender stream of college-bred students for the ministry will dry up altogether."

All streams have their sources in high ground. In the case of this stream, the source is in the bosom of the family. In the family we need to have a pure and intensive home religion, a religion of the old type. Water sources in low-lying, latitudinous plains never give rise to rivers. They produce at most mud-holes. Intellectually our homes *are* on high ground. By far the largest number of college students come from protestant homes. Are they as intensely religious? Have they their minds set on things that are above where Christ is seated on the right hand of God? By this I mean are they religiously and spiritually minded, and that not in the sense that they are oblivious to this world, for the things that are truly heavenly are good for the things of this world also. Are our homes as intensely interested in the good that men do for each other as they are in the money value of human service?

But when the family *is* earnestly religious, stresses the

altruistic and spiritual values of life, and so turns the thoughts of the sons and daughters to the ministry or missions, there is also needed a similar spirit in the public schools. There is to-day, as there has no doubt always been, a naturalistic, anti-supernaturalistic tendency in some teachers which can turn the stream of ministerial students aside. In Dayton a high school teacher is reported to have said to his classes, "You cannot prove that there is a God; you do not know whether there is a God or not." We do not want religious (denominational) instruction in our public schools, and I am sure we do not want irreligion taught. Ours is a Christian country and it is truly American to foster the religion of the Bible in the hearts of the rising generation. This irreligious attitude is dangerous in direct proportion to ignorance and conceit, those Siamese twins, for a little knowledge is a dangerous thing.

It is now quite common to urge upon high school pupils that they make a choice of life calling while in high school. The tender twig of sprouting inclination toward the ministry, that had been planted by pious parents, may easily be blasted by sneering infidel teachers, or by such whose adverse attitude to religion and the Bible is known, especially if they are otherwise attractive.

It is known that those churches that maintain parochial schools have no lack of students for the ministry. The Catholic University of America in Washington, D. C., reported in 1921 twelve hundred students. The Missouri Lutherans have in Concordia Seminary at St. Louis, Mo., 382 students. I understand that our own church in the North West gains many students through its parochial schools.

I would not, on this account, advocate parochial schools, but it does seem that there is a religious way of teaching young people that leads them to the church and its ministry. It is perhaps not so much *what* is taught, not so much what the "program" is, as how the teaching is done. One

could so teach the Lord's Prayer as to make infidels. This, I think, was the case very largely in Germany with its state-church, where religious instruction was extensively given, but often by avowed infidels, and the result was, as I know from personal observation, disastrous to religious life. In a college that I know, a teacher in philosophy used to bring before his students some so-called scientific or philosophic truth and then turn sneeringly to his classes with the question, "Now what do you think of your Bible, or of your religion?" Out of ten students that entered the freshman class with the ministry in view only two finally came to the seminary and they with a decidedly anti-Christian, or naturalistic Weltanschauung.

I find, or I think I find, that those churches or schools that stress the Bible as the word of God, or are more intensely positive in their teaching, have, generally at least, more students than those who discredit the Bible, or are broadly liberal. So-called Bible schools are overcrowded. Now we may say, This is narrow and unscientific. Be it so, but it is only strong conviction that begets conviction and we may become so tolerant that we hold nothing with a burning conviction and become flat and forceless. I noticed when the Rhine was narrow, as at Basel, it was forceful, and when it became broad it was weak, as in Holland. I do not mean that we should be narrow, but I fear that we may be, or seem to be, so favorable to all views that we lack conviction in any, and that to such an extent that we can not beget any conviction at all. Whatever our views may be, they ought to be held with such fire of soul as to set others on fire. I fear we as ministers ourselves lack here.

We should demand of our teachers in school and college that they have not only the cold intellectual light of the firefly but also the burning rays of the midday sun. The silvery light of the moon is not vivifying. Things die in merely intellectual light. We should expect of our col-

leges that they set men on fire for the good, for God. Great movements in history were always driven by heart power, by conviction of soul. So Peter the Hermit and others. We have a right to expect thus much, especially of our denominational colleges, that is light and heat, direction and power. Devotion to a great cause, to a Person who is our Saviour and King, is apt to drive one into the army of the ministry. There is no contradiction between intellect and heart, on the contrary a glowing heart makes a truly keen intellect. But if we have no heart in the work in which we are engaged, we cannot convert others to our task. I wonder whether a firm would employ a salesman who had as little enthusiasm for the great and fine points of his goods as we in the schools and the ministry have, or show, for the merits of *our* goods.

It might be of advantage to have in our colleges a course of Bible instruction in which the aim would be, not to give the cold facts and atomistic events, whether with conservative or liberal bias, but so to present it as to show what this old book has meant to man individually and collectively, what are its spiritual resources, its truly great and useful ideals and that these in ages past have made men, individual men and nations. Such a course ought to impress upon the mind of the thoughtful college student the fact that the principles of this book, when rightly understood, would and do change the social order, the national and international, political and commercial relations. It seems that the Bible, both Old and New Testaments, could be so presented that the red-blooded young man would feel within him the stirring heroism that would cause him to take this book as an invincible sword to fight the battles of the Lord for God and for man, and to free a world lying imprisoned in dungeons of ignorance and sin.

Then, also, a course of church history could be given in which is stressed the influence and power of the Church as a factor that makes for the uplift of the race. Kidd in his

book on Social Evolution and Lecky in History of European *Morals point out the leavening and uplifting influence of the Christian Church.* The Church is not defunct nor moribund. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against It." It is still manly to espouse her cause. She is still the power of God unto salvation of man and mankind, of institutions and nations, *for unto her is committed the truth of God, the Gospel of Jesus Christ.* What is the matter with the Church is that she needs *men* to espouse her cause, to buckle on her armor. The Church suffers violence and men of violence should take her by force. Have we ministers and teachers and Christian laity not taken our task too lackadaisically, too much as a side issue, and is it for this reason that no more are pressing into it? We do not enthuse over the Church. We do not burn with the love for her which she deserves and which we have been called to show to the world. There is not enough enthusiasm for the Church and the good it has done and can do. Our colleges do not seem to have it. Do they shrink from stressing the ministry? Have not the colleges and the ministry forsaken the fountain of living water and dug for themselves cisterns that hold no water?

Again it seems that a professor or college pastor who could sympathetically appreciate the worth and value of the sciences and philosophy taught in the college and who was a devout experienced Christian could lead the student over from nature to nature's God, and show that there is no contradiction between science and religion, between the real facts learned in the college and the spiritual realities for which the Bible stands as witness. It may not be possible to explain the relation between the temporal and the eternal, but neither can we explain how a prick of a pin, which is a mode of physical motion, becomes a mental state of pain. But the fact that both are true cannot be denied. The same may be true in the case of the earthly and the heavenly, the natural and the super-natural. A wise and sympha-

thetic professor or pastor might remove hindrances from the minds of young men and help them to reconcile the ministry, the religion of the Bible with their other convictions and lead them intelligently into the ministry.

But above all, the spirit and not merely the curriculum will be what counts.

CENTRAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
DAYTON, OHIO

4. THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AS IT AFFECTS THE COLLEGE, SEEN FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE

HOWARD R. OMWAKE

Are the Reformed Church Colleges providing the atmosphere and training for their students which will produce men and women of strong, positive Christian ideals, who become later enthusiastic leaders in Christian work?

No thoughtful person will deny that this is a most pertinent question for all colleges, bringing many responsibilities to all college administrators, and particularly to those directing the affairs of what we call denominational colleges.

The fact that a trickling stream of 5 or 6 students annually flows across College Avenue from Franklin and Marshall College to the Theological Seminary ought to stimulate thorough self-introspection on the part of all parties concerned. Ministers too often tell us that the college men in their congregations are the least interested in the work of the church. Allow for the fact that these statements are probably exaggerated, due to a feeling of disappointed expectation on the minister's part; allow also that certain phases of church work in which the minister expects his people to be interested may be archaic or ill-conceived, yet enough truth remains in the statement to render it a serious indictment of the product of our colleges.

Not long ago a leading figure in educational work in Pennsylvania, a member of the Reformed Church, regretted the fact, as he put it, that no Franklin and Marshall men in his city seemed to take any particular interest in the religious life of the community. He thought, and it seems to me very properly so, that college men should be positive and active forces in the work of the church, especially in exerting the church's influence in matters pertaining to civic and social betterment.

For a number of years this question has come in many aspects to the attention of the authorities of Franklin and Marshall College, and has claimed their serious consideration. It has been the subject of anxious thought elsewhere, too.

In the same spirit which led to the founding of the early colonial colleges, Marshall College, though at a much later date, was founded chiefly to train men for the Christian ministry. With the union of Franklin and Marshall Colleges into one Institution, this principle was given a wider sphere of operation, and the primary purpose of the new institution became the training of men, not only for the Christian ministry, but for participation in other fields of social activity, under the inspiration of high Christian ideals and under the guidance of positive Christian principles.

Such is the obligation of the college to-day. The constant element in this obligation lies in the fact that we are a denominational college, supposedly fostering the ideals and principles embodied in the Reformed faith; as an organized part of the whole Reformed Institution, the College must aggressively push the purposes and policies of the church, and in every possible way work for the achievement of the aims of Protestantism, as they are defined and set before our particular denomination. In other words, our colleges are not free to set their own aims and go their own ways, but must always consider their problems in their relation to the whole work of the church. This obligation

has lately been renewed in a definite way, when each institution participated in the results of a churchwide financial campaign, carried on as an organized denominational movement.

Certain varying elements enter into the meeting of this obligation, and these bring the greatest difficulties.

First of all, the home conditions of our students have changed and are changing. It used to be that only a boy here or there went to college, who showed marked ability or felt a definite call to some life work for which a college education was necessary. This boy came to college from a very definite motive, and the function of the college in his case was comparatively simple. Nowadays, parents try to give all their children a college education, irrespective of purposes or abilities. The students who come to college fall under these heads:

1. Those who come to secure a preparation for a definite line of work already determined upon.

2. Those who come with no particular idea of what they will do later in life, but with a hazy conviction that a college education is a *sine qua non* of success in after life.

3. Those who are merely "sent"—occasionally to be rid of them at home, sometimes because social status demands that the son or daughter go to college, sometimes because parents have an ill-defined, yet admirable, faith in the virtues of a college training. The crowded colleges of to-day have many students in each of these categories.

With their interactions and reactions on one another, what flexibility of atmosphere and of courses is necessary to influence in the right way and to the highest degree the students in each of these classes!

Changed and changing conditions in society demand men with trained minds in many lines of work. This has led to the amplifying of the college curriculum. It is safe to say that there are few colleges in the land whose scientific or technical departments do not far outnumber in students

the arts department. At present, in Franklin and Marshall College there are 139 candidates for the A.B. degree, and 311 candidates for the B.S. degree, either in Science or in Economics. This preponderance of B.S. men has greatly increased since the war. It is in response to a recognition of the advantages of the trained man in business or industrial life over the "self-made" man. The colleges are, no doubt, doing their best to provide the training desired, and at the same time, maintain their traditional atmospheres. If they succeed in doing the latter, it will be at the cost of utmost effort and the diligent stimulation of all the influences in the college that work to that end. It is the presence of this great number of men in college interested in the study of scientific or business problems, and in little else, that multiplies the problems of furnishing adequate religious education in colleges—and, of course, multiplies the obligation on the college to furnish it.

In view of the various elements that make up the student body of a modern college, and in view of the highly stimulated demand for technical, scientific and business training, the problem for the denominational college of how best to train its men and women so that in life they may perform in the highest degree possible the duties and obligations of trained Christian leadership, becomes a complex and momentous question.

The fields into which the graduates of a college like Franklin and Marshall go are—

The Ministry.

Teaching.

Medical and Scientific Work.

Business and Legal Work, and a small number into other pursuits.

Out of the present Freshman class in this College if, upon graduation, 7 go to the Theological Seminary, those 7 will represent 20 per cent. of the A.B. men—not a small percentage. The problem of securing future ministers has

some of its roots in the earlier education and environment. In the High Schools, the great majority of students take the Scientific or Technical courses, hence are not prepared for an Arts course; therefore, they are cut off at the start from giving the call to the ministry serious consideration—at least they think they are. This is a problem that calls for the adjustment of curricula in both colleges and seminary, for it is not likely that the public schools, aiming to prepare their students for life-work, will ever swing back toward the classical studies.

One can not help but feel, however, that courses in college of equal status with other courses, bearing on the history, philosophy, organization and accomplishments of the Christian Church, would place the work of the ministry on a plane demanding equal consideration with other possible callings.

About $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{1}{4}$ of our graduates teach—at least for a while, many of them for life. These are men whom the college ought to send out into the world with the finest of Christian ideals and a deeply rooted purpose to achieve them. The Public School teacher now shares with the minister what used to be the latter's almost exclusive field—the opportunity to mould the influences that condition society.

27 members of the Freshman class are 2-year Pre-Medical students, whose two years are so filled with required scientific work that there is little time left for any other study—and yet, *who* more than a physician needs the fine culture of the Christian religion?

And very special account must be taken of the number of men which this college sends annually into business careers, a number which will be much greater in coming years, as the new course in Business Administration, now in its second year, works through and graduates men.

In Ursinus College and Heidelberg University, where similar courses have recently been established, the same con-

dition holds. Is there something which can be done to transform the graduate who takes up a business career, from merely a respected business man into a leader in all movements whose impetus comes from a spirit of brotherhood? Our college graduates should be more than trained successful business men: they should have heart and vision, and a strong impelling motive to realize the vision.

What are we doing to provide this education in the Christian religion? First of all, there is, of course, the silent and effective influence of the personality of the professors. A few interesting facts were learned from a questionnaire put to the Senior class last year. The first question was whether or not their Christian faith had grown or diminished in college. The great majority said their Christian faith had been increased during their college course. In reply to the question as to what caused the increase or decrease, those who felt their faith increased ascribed it almost entirely to the influence and example of the members of the Faculty, with whom they came in most intimate touch. A noticeable number of scientific students spoke particularly of the fact that they had acquired their training in the sciences under men whose lives were so deeply religious that the idea of a break between science and religion lost its force to them. The few who admitted a decrease in faith ascribed the decrease to home and other extra-college influences. Be all that as it may, the persistent and steady influence of the personality of professors must provide the atmosphere for collegiate instruction, and must be the background for definite courses of instruction bearing on life problems.

Each college is giving certain courses in its curriculum, bearing on this work, as follows:

Franklin and Marshall

English Bible, 2 semester hours required of all, in either Junior or Senior year.

Philosophy of History, 1 semester hour, elective.

Ethics, 4 semester hours required of all Seniors.

Ursinus

English Bible, 4 semester hours required of all 1st year students.

English Bible, 4 semester hours required of all 3rd year students.

Ethics, 3 semester hours required of all 4th year students.

Church History, 2 semester hours elective to all 4th year students.

Philosophy of Religion, 3 semester hours elective to all 4th year men.

Heidelberg University

Missions, 2 semester hours elective for Freshmen.

Rudimentary Ethics, 1 semester hour prescribed for Freshmen.

Ethics, 3 semester hours, presumably required, though catalog does not seem to state.

Evidences of Christianity, 3 semester hours.

Under department of Religious Education, the following courses are listed:

Introduction to the World Field of Religious Education, 1 semester hour.

Purpose of Christian Religion, 1 semester hour.

Specialization for Work with Adolescents, 2 semester hours.

What results are we getting? One can speak for his own institution only; for Franklin and Marshall, we must frankly admit that they are not satisfactory. Too many men seem to have too slight a conception of the meaning of religion; their daily program shows too little the influence of religious motive or thought. And the charge, that our college-trained men do not meet the responsibilities of reli-

gious and social leadership in after life is only too well based on fact.

There should be a required course for Freshmen in the *Principles of Right Living*—call it what you may—then as the treasures of history, literature and science are opened up to them, some courses ought to be given which will lead the novice in scientific research across the danger zone of half-truth, and prevent the breach in thought which too often causes the student of science to cast off religion.

In the field of Pedagogy, courses bearing upon the training of Directors of religious work in local churches and Y. M. C. A.'s would be of immense value. Likewise, courses in Missions, showing the statesmanlike program of the church, and its accomplishments so far, would be valuable, not only vocationally, for those who expect to enter the field of mission work, but generally, as well. Just what courses could or should be given can be determined only by an intimate study of conditions. They should be such that it would be impossible for a man to be graduated from this college without having been under a growing influence, from Freshman year to graduation, the effect of which would be to articulate his knowledge of material things with a ruling purpose, in which the spirit of service would be the dominant note.

This is the work of a department of religious education. It can not be effectively done by scattered, uncoordinated courses, given by a number of professors in a number of departments. The purpose and scope of such a department is aptly defined under the "Department of Religious Education" of the Yale Divinity School: "The Department of Religious Education aims to prepare young men (1) for leadership in moral and religious education, (2) for Young Men's Christian Association leadership, (3) for intelligent leadership as Christian laymen in urban and rural communities. To this end it furnishes a thorough training in the history and essential nature of religion; in the Old and

New Testament Scriptures; and in the nature, philosophy, history, organization and practical workings of the Christian religion."

A Chair in our Faculty which will do this will help much to solve this pressing problem.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE,
LANCASTER, PA.

5. THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

C. A. BROWN

The Problem of Religious Education is as old as religion itself. While man may be incurably religious, there are always those whose attainments in religion are deficient according to the standards of their time. The Hebrews were first among ancient peoples in their interest in spiritual matters, but even they at times became so indifferent to their God that they literally lost the Bible. In comparatively recent times, the Sunday School, the Christian Endeavor Society, the Young Men's Christian Society, and other similar organizations, have come into being in response to the need of better religious training. That there is a problem of religious education in preparatory schools, as well as in practically every other type of school, may, therefore, be conceded without discussion.

But while the existence of the problem is admitted, its essential features, its known and its unknown quantities, are not so easily perceived. It is fashionable, in these days, to speak of many kinds of problems: the problem of the prayer meeting, of church attendance, of tithing, and many others familiar to all. But it is not so fashionable to say very much that is more specific than the fact that there is a problem. And yet, it is evident that unless the precise things that make the problem can be isolated from non-essentials, there can be no reasonable hope of finding a solution.

What is the evidence that justifies us in saying that boys from fourteen to eighteen years of age have not been properly trained in a religious sense? Occasionally teachers of freshmen in college report that these boys have only the most superficial knowledge of the form and content of the Bible. A candidate for college entrance is confronted with the task of writing a short theme on King David. His answer: I have never studied English History, not only provokes a smile in the reader, but also confirms his suspicion that school boys know very little, indeed, about the greatest book in the world. Now, these are only bits of evidence, but they are typical, and a critical general survey would probably reveal enough facts to prove the conclusion to which these bits of evidence point.

But the problem of religious education in preparatory schools goes deeper than the matter of form and content of the Bible. The great moral failures in life can hardly be ascribed to a more or less general inability to find the text of a Sunday morning sermon. Men fail for many other reasons, some, perhaps the most important, of which are a lack of a fine sense of duty, a lack of a keen sense of value, and an affection for things that debase. From the standpoint of each one of these, the school boy is certainly in need of religious training in its very best sense.

Of course, every boy has a sense of duty. But in most cases it is not what it could be and should be. There are workmen who are impelled to work a day for a day's wage by a sense of duty. There are office holders who serve the public because a sense of duty compels them to do so. There are parents who teach and train their children because a sense of duty will not let them do otherwise. And there are boys who go through the work of a day without shirking in any respect because it is their duty to be faithful. But there are many in whose conduct a sense of duty is a very feeble determinant, and among boys, the number of those who feel that duties must be performed at any cost is much too small.

While the fact that a boy's sense of duty is not very fully developed is one of the things that make the problem, so far as religious education is concerned, it should be said in defense of the boy that the blame for his deficiency apparently rests squarely upon his home and early school training. If a boy was never taught to look upon some work as his particular job, if he was never required to do certain things, he never had a chance to develop a sense of duty. And the wonder is, not so much that he is deficient in the feeling that certain things must be done because they ought to be done, but that he reaches the threshold of early manhood still able to develop a high regard for duty as a motive in human conduct.

It is hard to imagine what a transformation could be wrought in a school if every boy could be persuaded to do his duty. Rule books and blue books could be thrown away. Smoking rules could be abolished. Faculty supervision of many activities could be reduced to a negligible quantity. In short, a paradise on earth could be realized for headmasters in a day. But no one has ever been able to persuade all boys in school to allow a sense of duty to determine their conduct, and as a consequence the problem of religious training, so far as it concerns this phase of the subject, still remains.

But conduct also depends upon a sense of value. A boy with a fine sense of duty may yet do the wrong thing because he does not estimate various things at their proper values. He is quite certain, for instance, that it is his duty to study every lesson conscientiously, and he is determined to do his duty, but his sense of value, so far as it concerns methods of work, is defective. He cannot pick out essentials and master them. He wastes time on unimportant and insignificant details. He fails to cover all his assignments. He becomes discouraged, and in the end, perhaps, leaves school. His sense of duty is all right, but his sense of value is all wrong, and in his particular case the defective sense finally controls in the determination of conduct.

It is evident, therefore, that one of the phases of the problem of religious education is the cultivation of a keen sense of value. It is not enough for a boy to feel that he ought to choose the best things within reach at all times. He must also know what is best. If he does not know, he is certain to blunder in his choice of companions, books, recreation, and every other thing that has a bearing upon his development. He needs to be taught, and this fact must be kept in mind by those responsible for his religious training.

Affection was suggested as a motive in the conduct of a preparatory school boy. I do not like Plane Geometry, or Latin, or Physics, is a remark frequently heard on a school campus. The boy usually explains his dislike by saying that he cannot understand the particular subject. Perhaps, the failure to understand is the result of the dislike. However that may be, the boy practically admits that his likes and dislikes have much to do with the quality of his work. He does not have a strong sense of duty, his sense of value is not very reliable, and in the fact of the weakness of these he allows his affection for particular subjects, particular teachers, particular recreations, and so on, to determine his conduct as a student in the class room, as a fellow among the fellows, and as a player on the field. Moreover, he allows his affections to determine what kind of ideas shall have free reign in his mind. From the standpoint of this phase of the subject, the problem of religious education reduces itself to a problem of educating the boy in such a way that he will love the things that are worth while and hate the things that debase.

Assuming that the problem has been correctly analyzed, what can be suggested concerning its solution? Manifestly, compulsory Bible study under competent teachers would result in the eradication of the prevalent monumental ignorance of the form and content of the Bible, of its claims as a book of the finest biography, poetry, history, romance,

oratory. On the other hand, it is not certain that knowledge gained under compulsion would either last very long or be beneficial. Besides, it may be argued that compulsion might create a dislike for the Bible that would be very detrimental to the boy all the days of his life.

At any rate, the kind of religious training a boy needs is not so much the kind that results in the ability to write long essays on Bible characters, as the kind that develops a sense of duty, a keen sense of value, and a love for the finest things within reach. And a solution of the problem means nothing less than the persistent coöperation of many influences. Week-day chapel services have their value here. The daily reading of the Bible, with remarks that win the attention of the boy, the singing of the best church hymns, discussions that deal with matters of morality and conduct in a practical way, all count as factors in the solution of the problem of religious education in a school. Sunday chapel services are also a strong religious influence in the life of a boy. The custom followed by many of the best known preparatory schools of inviting able preachers to fill the school pulpit Sunday after Sunday is of the greatest value. A boy cannot listen to the best available preaching week after week for a year or several years without getting religious training of great importance. If the school is fortunate enough to have a chapel whose architecture and decorations are fine and inspiring, and if its service is dignified and rich in religious significance, the school's facilities for training a boy in a religious way are very good.

In this connection one should call attention to the value of missionary activity on the part of the school. In a well-known Sunday School publication dealing with the international lessons one commentator has something to say, regularly, about "doing the lesson." It is not too much to maintain that one way of training a boy in a religious sense is to give him an opportunity to do some concrete

religious thing such as the making of a contribution for Christian work of some character, somewhere in the world.

Another influence which counts as a factor in the religious training of a boy in a preparatory school is the influence of the masters. A master's contact with a boy in this kind of a school is a twenty-four-hour contact under a great variety of circumstances. He meets the boy in the class room, in the dining room, on the athletic field, on hikes, and in the dormitory. He has many opportunities to inspire a boy and to stimulate his development along the lines indicated before. And it cannot be denied that the men who teach in a high-grade preparatory school are doing much to help solve the problem of religious training.

One other influence should be mentioned, and that is the influence of splendid women, whose relation to the school is perhaps only semi-official, but whose presence and activities constantly hold before the school boy ideals with which he first came into contact as a boy in a home, and which could not be maintained in a world of men alone. These women, whether they do it consciously or not, are coöperating with all the other influences named in developing in boys a finer sense of duty, a keener sense of value, and a love for the best things that life can offer.

MERCERSBURG ACADEMY,
MERCERSBURG, PA.

6. THE PROBLEM OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE REFORMED CHURCH AS IT RELATES ITSELF TO THE PUBLICATION AND SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD

C. A. HAUSER

THE SCOPE OF THE WORK

The title PUBLICATION AND SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD is no longer coterminous with the original purpose of this Board, since it fails to express the full scope of this Board's

work as it now shapes itself. Religious education in the local Church has experienced such a marked expansion and has undergone such modifications that, in the interest of progress as well as accuracy of nomenclature, the denominational Sunday School leaders now speak of the Church School as connoting the enlarged task of religious education in the local Church School. In addition to the Sunday period of the Church School, there has come the opportunity for the long-sought-for week-day sessions. These week-day sessions are conceived of, not merely as comprising the formal work of teaching the pupils in the lower grades now in the Sunday School, but also the educational work as this is being carried on by the various organizations, composed of children, young people and adults in the local Church. In the Church School scheme of education there is included also the work of catechisation under the direction of the pastor. Through the Church School, the Church seeks to realize in action the spiritual objectives set forth from Sunday to Sunday in the pulpit.

To bring these various educational activities in the local Church into a unified relationship and to develop a program of religious education that will do justice to each individual in the congregation and to the entire work of the denomination as this finds expression in the various Church Boards and agencies, is the scope of the work of the Publication and Sunday School Board. This enlarged scope of the Board's work is not one arbitrarily defined, nor does it imply increased responsibility arbitrarily assumed. The changed status has resulted from the natural normal development of the educational work in the local Church. Each step of this development has been reported to General Synod and has had its official sanction. (See General Synod Minutes, especially the last two or three trienniums.)

Now it happens that side by side with the educational work conducted by the Publication and Sunday School Board, other Church boards and agencies of our denomina-

tion have been carried along on the wave of the present educational awakening. Each of these agencies represents a form of work that requires educational promotion; hence, according to good- or bad-Reformed traditional independence, each one has set up its promotion machinery in the local Church regardless of the other, and General Synod has given its sanction without having considered with sufficient care how these tasks stand related to each other; nor did the situation seem to require it until the recent challenge for a more thoroughgoing educational procedure in religious education made it necessary.

The result is that no little friction and confusion has resulted; in addition, much important work is being neglected for fear of giving offense. Anyone who is familiar at all with educational procedure as it pertains to administration must see how hopeless the task of promulgating an adequate program of religious education in the local Church must be as long as this state of affairs continues. The more the other Church boards and agencies improve the technique of their educational departments—and they are doing it steadily—the more critical the problem of religious education in the local Church will become. Chaos must ultimately result unless immediate steps are taken to remedy the difficulty.

The logic of the situation therefore requires that General Synod carefully study this problem from the viewpoint of all the agencies concerned and place the responsibility for a coördinated program of religious education in the local Church in the hands of a single agency that shall be representative of the entire task of the Church and of all the agencies engaged in it. In the nature of the case, the Publication and Sunday School Board, which has had the most accessible approach to the study of the technique of education and has devoted itself more fully to this problem than any of the other Church boards and agencies, and which has the most direct access to the source of religious

educational materials, should be entrusted with this task. For such a step there is ample precedent among the various Protestant denominations—to mention only the Canadian Presbyterians and in somewhat modified form the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Besides, the drift in all denominations is in this direction. Such a procedure, however, implies, as was suggested above, a change of name that shall be adequate to the new task, and a change in the personnel representing it so as to include in the reorganized body all the agencies in the local Church now engaged in religious education in whatever form. The manner in which this might be done will be indicated further on in this paper.

AIM AND OBJECTIVE OF THE CHURCH SCHOOL

It should be stated very definitely and clearly that the ultimate aim of religious education in the local Church is not the multiplication of organizations, be they Sunday Schools, Week-day Schools, Young People's Societies, Missionary Societies, or whatever name they may bear. Neither is it the ultimate aim of religious education to secure money from the pupils, be the cause ever so important. Organizations may be a means to the end that religious education has in view, and the giving of money may be a product or an expression of religious education, but the fundamental aim of religious education, let it be said once for all, is to develop Christian personality, that results in Christian conduct, adequate to meet every situation in life, on the part of every pupil. Whatever organizations will best help to realize that great goal should be called into being and developed to the utmost. Organizations that hinder, either because they have outlived their usefulness, or because they are non-productive of religious fruitage, we should have the wisdom to let die or the courage to set aside with tact and good grace when the proper time comes. Naturally such an aim for the Church School

implies that knowledge must be imparted, but not as an end in itself, with the shadowy hope that in some mysterious way character in the abstract—if there be such a thing—may result. Knowledge is imparted rather with the definite purpose that it will result in specific forms of conduct control, through the means of adequate teaching materials and methods. In other words, the process of religious development comes not by magic but by the power of God, proceeding through spiritual means and methods applied along the highway of hard work, combined with faith and prayer, by teachers possessing spiritual personalities and intellectual background.

FORM OF ORGANIZATION SUGGESTED

That the local Church is over-organized no person competent to judge will deny. A director of religious education in Toledo reported to the Kansas City Sunday School Convention in June that he knew of a Church that had 64 different treasurers, which meant at least that number of Church organizations, and that each of these 64 organizations was appealed to for funds from some overhead denominational agency or other benevolent organization. The demand of the hour in the local Church is for less organizations and more organization among the few that may be necessary.

The Publication and Sunday School Board suggests the following flexible but simple form of organization for the promotion of the educational work in the local Church. You will note the basis upon which this form of organization rests is that of persons and their needs rather than organizations. In addition, the needs of persons are considered as these express themselves in terms of their unfolding through the years.

A UNIFIED FORM OF ORGANIZATION
FOR
THE PROMOTION OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE
LOCAL CHURCH

Congregation

Pastor and Consistory

Council of Religious Education

Director of Religious Education—Superintendent
The three Division Counsellors and two persons
chosen at large from the Church Membership.

The Children's Division of
the Church (1-12)

1. *The Children's Division Council.*

The Children's Division Counsellor.

Representatives of each organization.

2. *Children's Division Organizations.*

Beginners, Primary and Junior Departments of the Church School.

Junior Mission Band.

Junior C. E. Society, etc.

The Adult Division of the
Church (24 and older)

1. *The Adult Division Council.*

The Adult Division Counsellor.
Other representatives chosen by each organization in the Adult Division.

2. *Adult Division Organizations.*

Adult Bible Classes.

Home Department.

Parents Classes.

Brotherhoods and other men's organizations.

Women's Missionary Society and other women's organizations, etc.

The Young People's Division of the Church (12-24)

1. *The Young People's Council.*

The Young People's Counsellor and other representatives chosen by each of the young people's organizations in the congregation.

2. *Young People's Division Organizations.*

The Intermediate, Senior and Young People's Departments of the Church School.

The Young People's Societies.

Young Women's Missionary Society.

Boys and Girls Scouts, etc.

COÖPERATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

The problem of religious education in the local Church is so large and so complex that we need all the wisdom and help from any and every source able to give it. There is no disposition to exclude anybody, but rather to bind together all who can help into a bond of closest fellowship and effort.

As far as the Publication and Sunday School Board is concerned, it is very zealous that there shall be developed a program of religious education in the local Church that shall be thoroughly educational in aim, in materials, method and organization—which implies also in teaching personnel and administrative supervision.

Other Church Boards and Agencies engaged in religious education in the Local Church.

A unified program that shall be adequate to meet this need will have to bring into proper coöperative relationship with the work of the Publication and Sunday School Board, the activities now carried on by the Missionary Educational Department of the Home and Foreign Missionary Boards, and more specifically their Summer Conferences, the Rural work program, Evangelism, and Social Service programs of the Home Board, and the Educational program of the Women's Missionary Society.

The problem of Missionary Education in the Local Church.

Missionary Education is one of the most burning problems in the local Church. Instead of having no advocates as in past decades, we are now blessed with the fact that many agencies are zealous to render service in this field. It must be evident to everyone that there is grave danger in such a situation. Considered from the point of view of educational theory, Missions constitutes a branch of education, side by side with other branches such as Bible study, Church History, Doctrine and allied subjects. It should

therefore be promoted as any of the other units in the curriculum. Eventually, when the work of religious education is properly organized and correlated, this will be done. But at present this branch of the educational task still requires separate treatment by a separate agency. That this may be done, there will be need of a sub-department of Missionary Education in the proposed Department of Religious Education in the Local Church. This Department should take rank by the side of the educational, editorial and other departments of what is now the Publication and Sunday School Board.

The closest possible coöperation between the seminaries, colleges and academies is of vital importance in this problem, for upon them the local Church will have to depend for the higher leadership and skilled teachers necessary to carry out the new program of religious education in the local Church. The local Church School can not rise higher than the level of opportunity for leadership offered in the higher institutions of the Church.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS LOOKING TOWARD NECESSARY REORGANIZATION

Realizing that the group gathered in this Conference represents but different phases of a single problem, it is our firm conviction that there should be called into being one general educational agency, to which shall be entrusted the entire responsibility of Religious Education in the denomination. It has been suggested frequently that this agency should be called "THE BOARD OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION." This Board, it seems to us, has a two-fold function to perform: first, as it relates to the higher institutions of learning; second, as it relates to the religious education in the local Church. This two-fold function therefore presupposes the following form of organization:

The Board of Christian Education

- I. The Department of Religious Education in the Higher Educational Institutions.
- II. The Department of Religious Education in the Local Church.

What form of organization the Department of Religious Education in the Higher Educational Institutions shall take belongs to others in this group to determine. Our task is to make suggestions as to the form of organization of the Department of Religious Education in the local Church, a new name that will correspond with the task facing the present Publication and Sunday School Board, and which will represent the modifications in organization necessary if the educational work is to march forward to fulfill its lofty mission of promoting the religious life of the children, youth, and older folks as well, in our congregations. The following form of reorganization, which is both comprehensive in program and representative in personnel, is suggested by the Publication and Sunday School Board.

SUGGESTED OUTLINE FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF THE

II. DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN
THE LOCAL CHURCH

The recent movement to establish departments of Religious Education in the more prominent denominational schools of higher learning grows out of the enlarging educational need of the local Church. Just how this problem will be worked out in the educational institutions of our denomination is the task of the proposed II. Department of Religious Education in the Higher Educational Institutions. Our province is merely to indicate the type of workers the Church School is greatly in need of.

II. DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE LOCAL CHURCH

1	2	3	4	5	6
Educational Staff	Editorial Staff	Missionary Staff	Curriculum Committee	Supplies and Publications	Miscellaneous
Secretary Children's Div. Supt. Young People's Div. Supt. Adult Div. Supt. Directors Week Day R. E. Synodical Directors. Field Workers. Advisory Committee?	Secretary. Editor. Lesson Writers. Editor of Lesson Papers. Educational Publications. Editor Outlook of Missions. Editor Missionary Materials. Advisory Committee?	Secretary. Children's Div. Supt. Young People's Supt. Adult Division Supt. Director of Week Day R. E. General Editor. Missionary Secretary. Missionary Editors. Advisory Committee?	Secretary. Editor of MESSENGER. Supt. of Publications. MESSENGER. Lesson Periodicals. Books and Supplies.		
Secretary. Department Secretary. Representatives of the Board of Home Missions. Board of Foreign Missions. Woman's Missionary Society. Field Workers. Educational Staff (a Rep. of). Editorial Staff (a Rep. of). Advisory Committee?			Secretary. Real Estate. Endowment Funds.		

We need immediately directors of Religious Education for the larger Churches, supervisors and teachers of week-day schools of religion, and also teaching deaconesses. In addition, opportunity should be offered in our colleges for the training of Christian laymen who can render efficient service in the Sunday and week-day schools. No Christian layman should be permitted to leave college without having instilled in him an appreciation of the value of thoroughgoing Religious Education in the local Church.

The Academy should offer introductory courses in Religious Education preparatory to the work in College. The province of the college we believe to be to lay such foundations in the general field of Religious Education as to enable the student to teach in the Church School as efficiently as in his Public School work. These general courses in Religious Education are to have a place of parity with all other scientific studies and should be given with the view of having students receive credit toward post-graduate work in other institutions. To the theological seminary belongs the responsibility of offering advanced courses in Religious Education for pastors, directors and supervisors of Religious Education. These opportunities for religious education should be open to both sexes. For the training of such educational leaders for the local Church School, our denomination justly looks to its higher educational institutions.

Therefore in order that there may be unity in our denomination as to our educational aims, materials of education produced, and methods used, as well as an adequate leadership to meet the present crisis, there is need of a single Board of Education in which the specific task facing the higher educational institutions and that of the local Church may be brought into a correlative and coöperative relationship.

BOARD OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Executive

I. DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE HIGHER INSTITUTIONS.

II. DEPARTMENT OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE LOCAL CHURCH.

Secretary

Secretary

Data to be supplied by leaders in the Higher Institutions.

1. Educational Staff

Children's Div. Supt.
 Young People's Div. Supt.
 Adult Division Supt.
 Director Week Day R. E.
 Synodical Directors.
 Field Workers.
 Advisory Committee?

3. Missionary Staff

Department Secretary.
 Representatives of the Board of Home Missions.
 Board of Foreign Missions.
 Field Workers.
 Educational Staff (rep. of).
 Editorial Staff (rep. of).
 Advisory Committee?

5. Publications and Supplies

Editor of MESSENGER.
 Supt. of Publications.
 MESSENGER.
 Lesson Periodicals.
 Books and Supplies.

2. Editorial Staff

Editor in Chief.
 Lesson Writers.
 Editor of Lesson Papers.
 Educational Publications.
 Editor Outlook of Missions.
 Editor Missionary Materials.
 Advisory Committee?

4. Curriculum Committee

Children's Div. Supt.
 Young People's Div. Supt.
 Adult Division Supt.
 Director of Week Day R. E.
 General Editor.
 Missionary Secretary.
 Missionary Editors.
 Advisory Committee?

6. Miscellaneous

Real Estate.
 Endowment Funds.

7. THE PLACE OF MISSIONARY EDUCATION IN
A GENERAL PLAN OF RELIGIOUS EDUCA-
TION FOR THE REFORMED CHURCH

A. V. CASSELMAN

The Christian Church is responsible for the religious education of its members. If it is true that "Spiritual illiteracy is the greatest peril of organized society," we may well inquire whether such illiteracy exists in the Church of to-day. If it does, Christian educational leaders face a responsibility so grave that they may well pause to ask themselves if they are producing, or are likely to develop, under present methods, the well-rounded Christian so sorely needed in this world now.

Can the religious life be complete if it is not missionary-minded? We believe that inherent in the missionary message is the completeness of the Gospel. To use the words of Miss Emily C. Tillotson, one of the Missionary Educational Secretaries of the Protestant Episcopal Church, "Any presentation of the Gospel message in which the strongest emphasis is not ultimately missionary is bound to result in the production of a type of Christian who, no matter how real is his personal devotion to Christ, suffers from a spiritual blind spot which obscures from him the world-wide vision which it is the aim of all religious education to give."

If the cause of Missions is to make its best contribution to the spiritual life of the Church and the individual Christian, its prosecution must rest on a sound educational basis. All too frequently it has been a matter of promotion exclusively, from the standpoint of some work to be immediately accomplished or of some organization to be sufficiently supported. Ultimately this method of procedure defeats the very purpose for which it was inaugurated. It is largely because of this method that the Church has failed to raise up "generations of intelligent world-visioned

Christians, earnestly devoted to the establishment of God's kingdom on earth, and loyally and progressively supporting the church in all its work at home and abroad."

We are fully convinced that the intelligent consideration of this theme rests upon our agreement to certain fundamentals which are foundation truths upon which we may build our super-structure of missionary education, as an integral and essential part of religious education. No claim for either theological or pedagogical exactness is made for these statements. They are essentially practical. They are as follows:

1. Jesus is the Son of God, sent of the Father to be the Saviour of the world.
2. The chief business of his followers is to bear witness to this truth.
3. The Church is the Kingdom of God on earth organized for the purpose of witnessing, and, as such, is essentially and primarily a missionary society; that is, an organized fellowship of missionaries.
4. No portion of the Church can or should assume or appropriate for itself the supreme and proper task of the whole Church.
5. All organizations for missionary education and propaganda in the Church are specialized efforts for the development of a specified portion of the Church in order that the whole Church may thereby the better realize and accomplish her mission.
6. Only as these specializations in missionary service reach and include every particular portion of the Church and coöperate for the accomplishment of the ultimate enterprise can they be supremely successful.

Now, with these fundamentals in mind, let us address ourselves to the important subject before us. When we speak of religious education, we do not have reference to the work of education as carried on by our academies, colleges and seminaries, but rather to the general work of the

Church in helping men to see life as set forth in the person and character of Jesus Christ, and in providing them with the impetus and ability needed for that life. We shall leave to others, who are especially fitted to do so, the formal defining of religious education.

When we approach the term missionary education we are met with a religious expedient. If, in the history of the Church, religious education had been properly and fully prosecuted, there would have been no need for such a specialized term as missionary education. This same thing is true of the term missionary society. If the Church had been unanimously true to her mission, there would not have sprung into existence a specialized class of Christians to be formed into a group called a missionary society. The best definition of a missionary society the writer has ever seen appears in the Year Book of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It reads thus: "The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society is the Church organized for the extension of the Kingdom. If you are a member of the Church, you are a member of the Society." However, we have fallen heirs to this form of Christian activity called missionary education. It is an old activity. St. Paul and St. Barnabas were compelled, because of the lack of vision of the first church at Jerusalem, to fall back upon missionary education before that early church saw the real vision of her Lord for His Kingdom. So we are "treading where the saints have trod." In the words of Gilbert Loveland, of the Methodist Church, in his new book on missionary education, entitled "Training World Christians," "The best thing for us to do is to read a worthy meaning into the term missionary education." Far be it from us to suggest the final definition of missionary education; but, for the purpose of this present occasion, we may define missionary education as the development of the possibilities of the immature Christian for the most effective participation in the efficient accomplishment of the missionary program of the

Church, as it relates itself especially to the unchurched at home and the unevangelized abroad.

The relationship of missionary education to religious education is, in its simplest sense, merely the relation of a part to the whole. Someone has said that "missionary character is only Christian character that has suffered no arrest of development," and we might say missionary education is simply religious education that has suffered no arrest of development. As intimated in a previous sentence, we firmly believe that missionary education is an integral and essential part of religious education, in the strongest and finest sense of those adjectives; in other words, that religious education is not a whole or complete thing without missionary education, and that it likewise loses its Christian essence when it is not missionary. Missionary education must always contribute to and never conflict with the religious educational program and should not be considered something extraneous or different from religious education.

Now, in practice, there have been two types of missionary education; one is the highly organized form of missionary promotion, not infrequently timed to the achievement of some great financial objective. It emphasizes the more spectacular features of missionary work, makes use of high pressure methods, indulges in elaborate publicity, and not infrequently loses the fine sense of proportion. The trouble with this whole scheme is that it is in the nature of an expedient which is under the necessity of being repeated time after time. Too often and too long has missionary education been placed on the promotional basis.

The other type of missionary education sets itself to a long range task and builds its program upon the solid foundation of established principles of education. The emotional appeal and the inspirational address, so necessary on occasions, cannot be continuously offered as a substitute for real missionary education. Nothing is more ur-

gent in the life of the church at the present moment than an enlarged horizon-wide view, if we are to secure and hold the attention and support of our members for a program of world advance in Christian missions. This type of missionary education is built for long and large results. It launches out into the deep. It takes into account the oncoming generations by careful cultivation among our children and youth of a sympathetic, natural and normal attitude towards missions as inherent within the New Testament and necessary to the life of the world. In the words of Rev. William A. Hill, Director of Missionary Education of the Baptist churches, "It is most unfortunate that there are so many persons within each denomination who have to be converted twice; once to make them Christians and once to make them missionary. We must somehow build our missionary education program that when a person is converted to Christianity, it will not be necessary later on to use high spiritual explosives to awaken in him an interest in missions."

The necessity for this high type of missionary education needs scarcely to be mentioned in this presence. Missionary education has been described by Rev. R. E. Diffendorfer, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as "The Christianizing of all our social contacts." When we think of the foreign field, we sense the sound reasoning which designates our present time as "The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions." In the language of one of the most observant of missionary secretaries: "We are witnessing a renaissance in Asia, that in regard to the bulk of population affected and the rapidity of development from antique to modern ideals, dwarfs in comparison anything that has previously occurred in the history of mankind. Instead of having to originate for themselves new ideals and standards, the intellectual leaders of the non-Christian world are able to appropriate ready-made the results of centuries of western development, and they have finally made up their minds to do

so. The methods of occidental civilization are being brought to bear, as speedily as circumstances will permit, on the one billion human beings, who have heretofore asked only to be let alone. The consequence of this unprecedented condition is a series of problems more complex and vast than any prophet, statesman or sociologist has yet been called upon to handle." We need not more than suggest that real education is necessary for the Christian solution of world problems.

Reverting again to Mr. Diffendorfer's definition of missionary education as "the Christianizing of all our social contacts" and applying this definition to the home mission field, we find that we face a need of missionary education and an opportunity for missionary leadership which is at once appalling and inspiring. The world will never be evangelized without America, and America will never be evangelized without intelligent study of all of our American problems in the light of the spirit of Christ.

The material for missionary education necessary to meet this world situation is supplied from three sources. First, of course, is the Bible with its missionary spirit. The Bible loses much of its message and much of its motive when it is not taught as a missionary book. No one can really be a Church School teacher, either on the Sabbath, or in the Daily Vacation Bible School, or in the Week-Day School for Religious Instruction, who leaves out of that teaching its missionary message. Missionary education is in this way indissolubly linked up with the Church School and its problem of religious education. The next source of material for missionary education is the history of missions. This begins with the Acts of the Apostles, but does not end there. The Church, as yet, does not realize the rich stores of information and inspiration which lie unopened and unheeded in her missionary annals. The Acts of the Apostles derive their power for inspiring the Church from the fact that they deliberately affirm that the Acts

recorded are the real acts of the Lord for a period of years from "the day in which He was taken up." The acts of our Lord in the life of his apostles do not close with the preaching of St. Paul in his hired house at Rome, but are paralleled to-day in the lives of modern missionaries. If the Church will but study this history of Missions she will find herself reading the acts of the living Christ in each generation. As one of the leaders of missionary education in England has said: "If Christ were dead this would not be so; but if he is alive, his deeds in the world have a vital place in the life of his disciples." The third source of material for missionary education is the Boards of Home and Foreign Missions. Through their activities our Church is brought into contact with the world-wide movements of the Kingdom of God on earth. From the very nature of the work delegated to them by the Church, they possess the modern missionary educational material which the Church needs and must have if she is to be truly trained for her share of the extension of the Kingdom. The Department of Missionary Education ought to be the medium through which this material is gathered and made available for every form of missionary education for the entire Church.

In the preparation and adjustment of this material of missionary education for practical use in the churches, two things must be kept constantly in mind. The first is that the fundamentals of missionary power, purpose and practice remain the same. The second is that the history and practical application of these fundamentals is continually changing. It will be readily seen that the bringing of these two forms of missionary activities intelligently before the Church will require two distinct types of missionary study-courses and text-books. The one course would be fundamental and fairly stable, based on the Scriptures and the past history of missions. It would have to do with the missionary truths that are practically the same generation after generation. An example of a text-book for this sort

of education is found in that splendid book of Dr. A. J. Brown's, *The Why and How of Foreign Missions*. This book should always be studied by the Church. Then there must be courses of study which have to do with that which is continually changing. Never before has this world been so kaleidoscopic. A plan of missionary education which does not take into account this fact is absolutely useless for the modern church. There is room and necessity for the constant issue of new text-books, such as is made possible by the Boards of Home and Foreign Missions of the United States and Canada, coöperating in the Missionary Education Movement. As an example, in this year's book by Dr. J. H. Fleming, entitled "Building with India," the two great things which influence the church life of India to-day are the great nationalist movement and the mass movement. A new book would have to be written on India every year to be really up-to-date with missionary information and inspiration. What is true of India is true of practically all the mission fields of the world.

Because of this new spirit in missionary education, the aims of missionary propaganda have been re-stated. The old missionary motto, "The evangelization of the world in this generation," is giving way to the more comprehensive and educational ideal described as "The accomplishment of the missionary enterprise." With this long-distance view of the whole missionary enterprise, the reasons for mission study take on an added educational significance. Let us thoughtfully consider some, such as the following:

It stimulates faith to see the glorious things that are being wrought on the mission fields at home and abroad.

It opens up anew the present power of the Holy Scriptures.

It trains in purposeful prayer.

It is an incentive to increased and intelligent benevolence.

It gives indisputable evidence that Christianity succeeds when it is given a real chance.

It broadens the horizon of the life of those who study.

It awakens and deepens the sympathies.

It leads to an appreciation of the universality of the Christian religion.

It enables one to appreciate the inestimable value of Christ in life to learn what conditions and lives are like where He is unknown.

It reveals as nothing else the fact that the power of the Scriptures and the Christ are the same to-day as they were in the days of the Apostles.

It compels one to clarify and certify his own religious convictions.

It reveals the significance of current events and their relation to the Kingdom of God.

It is an incentive to young men and women to organize and order their lives with reference to the Kingdom of God.

If we are allowed to change the emphasis and ask ourselves why we should study missions, we may reply, briefly, that modern missionary activity demands study, that it deserves study, and that it rewards study.

From the nature of the sources from which the material for missionary education is secured, and from the nature of the courses and methods of study in making use of this material, it is very evident that there is and must be much in common between missionary education and other forms of religious education. There is an interrelationship of subjects, and in these subjects there is an intermingling of ideas, and in the practical application of the whole affair there must be an intermeshing of activities. In the words of Dr. T. H. P. Sailer, "the great problem is to make the cogs of our educational machinery bite with the work that has been demanded by the enterprise." "Such a task," he says, "leaves us plenty of room for desirable developments."

"The desirable developments" are, for the most part, the eradication of three ecclesiastical faults of administration.

They are overlapping, competition, and confusion. When there is overlapping, two or more church organizations trying to do the same thing, there is sure to follow competition: and when competition is allowed to usurp the position of unity of action, then confusion is bound to result, and confusion is always disastrous to educational efficiency. In confusion there is always something lost, and the sad thing about it is that in missionary education, this some thing is always some one.

One cause of our present undesirable position may be fairly said to lie in the fact that we have not progressed beyond the departmental mind, that we have not yet seen the educational problem of the Church in terms of the whole. The way out of the situation is to replace the overlapping, competition and confusion with two decidedly different and decidedly superior methods: coördination and coöperation. Coördination is official and should come from above. Coördination must be worked out by the official judicatories of the Church and handed down as an authoritative method of church activity. Coöperation is practical and democratic and comes up from below. Coöperation cannot be handed down from official bodies; it must be handed up from the mass of loyal membership of the Church. Neither of these is complete without the other. Coördination without coöperation will fail. Neither can coöperation succeed without coördination. The solution sounds simple. Practically, however, with our present organization, this matter is not so simple as it sounds. In a conference of missionary educational secretaries some months ago, Dr. T. H. P. Sailer, Professor of Missionary Education in Teachers' College, was asked this question: "Should we have separate missionary societies and classes in the local church, or should all missionary instruction be under a single educational administration?" His characteristic answer was as follows: "This is very much like the question, Is a person better off married or single? It depends upon whom is married.

Theoretically, there are advantages in unification: missions is given its proper place as a required subject in religious education rather than an elective; responsibility for missionary education is placed on those in charge of religious education; competition of educational activities in the local church is forestalled; missions is given a claim on all the regular educational agencies of the church."

"There are also some possibly concrete disadvantages: while missionary education may be made more extensive, it may be much less intensive; it may place the administration in the hands of those who have only a perfunctory interest in it, and missions demands not only interest, but passion, for real results; it may deprive the local church of really live supplementary agencies."

"Therefore, do not remarry unless there is reasonable assurance that the stepmother will be kind to the children, *i.e.*, do not unify education unless the general director is vitally interested in missions and will give it more time than it now has, and unless he is interested in missionary results rather than merely in the scheduling of missionary lessons. Do not scrap going concerns that are accomplishing something, but keep them as supplementary for the present. Make sure that so many things are not combined in a course of religious education that no deep impressions are made."

At present there is much discussion amongst the educational secretaries of Mission Boards of the United States and Canada as to whether missionary education should be made a function of a denominational department of religious education, or whether it should be conducted independently by the Missionary Boards. It is rather generally agreed that missionary education should be made a department of religious education, if certain conditions can be fulfilled which are considered necessary for its effective functioning in this consolidation, such as these: The Department should represent a vital interest in missionary results. Missionary education should not be conducted by those who are not close

students of the missionary enterprise, who have never visited the field, and who have more interest in formal educational processes than in vital missionary products. There should be educational methods and patience in the slow processes of growth, but discontent unless something is actually achieved to further the enterprise. There should be active contact with and study of the field. Missionary education should not be scaled down to the methods of other subjects which are less vital.

For the accomplishment of such a program in our own Church the writer is of the opinion that there should be some sort of a Council of Missionary Education, whose work should be centered in the Department of Missionary Education, which department in turn should be properly articulated to a general board of religious education of some sort and its work there properly coördinated with other educational activities. Under our present ecclesiastical organization such a Council would consist of the Secretaries of the Home and Foreign Mission Boards, from whom the materials for use in the Church should be secured as we have previously intimated; representatives of the Educational Department of the Publication and Sunday School Board, and the Young People's Department; representatives of the Educational Commission of the Woman's Missionary Society, the Young Woman's Missionary Auxiliary and the Mission Band. After all these representatives have been mentioned, there is one representative lacking, the most important in some respects of all of them. There should be someone whose special business it is to represent the pastors of the Church, to visualize the whole process in the light of practical church efficiency. The Secretary of the Department, if he has had pastoral experience, ought to do this. With these representatives functioning as a Council, the material for missionary education could be brought practically to the attention of the people who are to be called upon to use it. Coördination of the work and coöperation of the workers could be established.

There is room and plenty of work for everybody. Not one of the agencies now operating with a special position in the work of missions would need to relinquish one bit of missionary effort.

In the prosecution of the work, there is great need of more extensive study, the study of fundamentals and of the things that do not change in missionary education. No form of church organization is so fitted to accomplish this as the Church School. To quote from Rev. G. T. Manley, of the Church Missionary Society, of England, "Even Bible study needs supplementing by missionary study. If we confine ourselves to historical proof, there is danger lest we come to believe only in a Christ of long ago. If we concentrate too much upon our own minor experience, there is danger of religion becoming too subjective and regarded only as a matter of personal opinion. A study of missionary work, added to the others, produces a robust, objective faith in Christ, as living and working in the world to-day. It is especially a need of the times."

But there is need of intensive study. The materials for this sort of work are continually shifting and changing. There is room for all of the societies here in the prosecution of this intensive study of changing fields and methods. It is doubtful if the Church School in its regular sessions would or could take the time for the use of all of this intensive material. Some extra form of organization would quite likely be necessary to carry on this intensive study outside of the time of the sessions of the school. Whether an organized class does it or some outside organization, the work of this organization should supplement and not duplicate the work of the Sunday School. By way of example, let us just notice one result of this lack of coördination and this lack of coöperation. A great deal is being done for the children of the Primary and Junior Departments of the Sunday School in missionary education. Not only are they given a great deal of this instruction in the Sunday School, but it is sup-

plemented by the Mission Bands outside of the Sunday School. Then these boys and girls go on to the Intermediate Department. The young women are fairly well taken care of by the Young Woman's Missionary Auxiliary, but the boys are left with practically no missionary training. No one is organized to care for them and they simply drop out. One of the first duties of any person projecting a comprehensive plan of missionary education is to provide proper missionary material for the education of our boys that they may grow into real missionary manhood.

Nor should we, in our search for a superior system and finely articulated machinery, forget that after all the pastor is the one person of primal importance in the matter of missionary education, and rightly so. Any system or plan of missionary education that leaves him out of consideration or does not plan materially for his assistance and help is faulty from the start. General plans for the general prosecution of missions to the whole congregation must not be omitted from any ideal plan of missionary education.

One very practical consideration should claim our attention in conclusion. The finest plan of missionary or religious education is merely a working tool for an educator. The most superior and complete program of missionary or religious education is of no value without some living personality to effect its practical realization. In the program of missionary education one of the most important things is the discovery and training of missionary leaders. Our summer conferences are to be devoted increasingly to this one particular aim. Those of the last summer were more successful in this line than any we have ever held. The Boards of Home and Foreign Missions, through a patient course of many years' work, have developed these conferences into their present efficiency. One hears occasionally a demand that these conferences should be broadened by making them general instead of missionary. The Boards of Home and Foreign Missions look with favor upon anything that will in-

crease the efficiency of these conferences and make them more truly useful. They will agree to have them broadened, if in that process they are not thinned. They are perfectly willing that they may be made better educationally by any improvement, but they are of the opinion that this improvement will not be made by making them less missionary. Their very success lies in the fact that they have tried to do one thing well. They will be made better only by bringing other subjects up to the present efficiency of the work of missions instead of by bringing the work of missions down to a lower level. If a comprehensive plan of religious education should be authorized by the Church, then it seems certain that real Summer Schools of Education would of necessity need to be established for the discovery and training of religious leaders, and that just as necessarily should some of these Summer Conferences be turned into real Schools of Missions for the discovery and training of missionary leaders.

As has been mentioned, the real aim of missions is the accomplishment of the missionary enterprise. The more immediate aim of missionary education is to fit the church for this task. That this may be done there needs to be established, first and foremost, a right attitude of mind and heart towards the work of missions, to which there must be added such teaching and training as will result in right action. In the language of Dr. D. J. Fleming, Professor of Missions at Union Theological Seminary, "the ultimate aim of missions is to develop a world-wide society of Christ-like individuals." This, too, is the ultimate aim of missionary education.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

8. THE EDUCATIONAL COMMISSION OF THE WOMEN'S MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF GEN- ERAL SYNOD

ELIZABETH HENDRICKS

Beginning with the earliest records of Hebrew history, we discern that God's plan for the nations included an intelligent womanhood. Our Lord, during his human life on earth, raised women to a position not given them before his day. It was Christ's life and influence that brought more fully the abundant life into the hearts of men and women and set a standard for womanhood, not recognized by the founder of any other of the world religions. Mohammedanism, Buddhism and Hinduism all deny woman a place, and make of her a chattel rather than a human soul.

In recognition, and deepest appreciation of the good that has come into their lives through the Christian religion, intelligent Christian women have for many years felt it to be their duty to give to others the knowledge which has so blessed their lives, that they, too, may know Christ.

In the early centuries the Church grew and extended its borders with great rapidity. All Christians were zealous missionaries. Then came centuries of indifference and darkness. After the Reformation each branch of the Church found it necessary to work, to hold what they had and bring about a healthy growth. This finally has developed into a more or less unselfish missionary spirit in all branches of the Church.

But not yet have we caught the spirit of the early Church in its zeal for making known the good news of salvation. The work being accomplished is great, but it is not enough. Realizing this, missionary-minded women set about to do something to help. As their vision fell upon the dark picture of India, China, or Africa, or any one of the non-Christian countries, the lot of women and children seemed infinitely sad and dreary. Then why not band ourselves to-

gether as Christian women to aid women and children of non-Christian lands? The earliest of these woman's Missionary organizations in our country dates back to about 1830. The writer grew up in a congregation where the Woman's Missionary organization dated back to 1833, all monies being sent through the American Board. Later as the various denominations formed their Boards of Missions, the women of these denominations did likewise, until the large denominations each have a Women's Board as well as a Board of Missions. The aim of the women has always been to care for the needs of women and children, and the funds given, to be over and above that given through the denominational Boards. A study of the development and growth of the Woman's Missionary Society in our denominations will in the future be a fascinating study to the Church historian. With small beginnings, for women have always been accustomed to filling their lives with the small duties, which taken as a whole constitute their daily labor in the home, the work started.

From year to year new paths have developed, great opportunities have opened, until not only a strong organization *is to be found in each denomination, but these organizations are federated and are doing considerable work in which all are united to aid the women and children of our own land as well as those in non-Christian lands.*

These federated bodies have given a great impetus to the work of missions, by their educational work—a real practical work of religious education. Woman, otherwise well educated, lacked a knowledge of religions other than Christian, *and had no information of the needs of other lands.* Missionary education which really is a most practical religious education is now the order of the day in all forward-looking congregations and women who have such an education cannot be petty and small minded in their thinking. Their vision reaches to the uttermost parts of the earth and is the real international vision.

Our Reformed Church, being composed of a conservative body of people, found her women slow to take up missionary work. They were late in starting, and have to an extent been slow in accomplishing, but the work has passed beyond the experimental stage and is a distinct part of our Church Life to-day. Under the guidance of the W. M. S. the young women of the Church, girls of High School and College age, have formed auxiliaries. This organization has filled a much felt need, and because of it, we hope that the next generation will find—broad-minded women to carry on their part of the Church work, and not the woeful lack of leaders as in the Church to-day.

The Mission Band, the third of our trio of organizations, is one of the oldest of our missionary organizations and of great educational value to the child. Boys and girls are members of this organization because it is composed of small children who can most readily be guided by women. This rule does not hold in the Y. W. M. A. nor in the W. M. S. After a certain age, the boy desires and should have, as leader in religious education, a manly man. The boy and the girl should arrive at the same end in their religious training, but the manner in which it is accomplished must necessarily differ.

While some men and some women may study the same text books with one teacher, most men and most women approach mission work and study from different angles and are not happy in united study. This "point of view" of man and woman is one of our serious problems. For generation upon generation woman has had opportunity to study man—always the dominant personality of God's creation. But modern man has not been afforded the same opportunity for study of woman because of her change in status throughout the centuries. It's been a case of "keeping up with Lizzie," and seems to many men rather a difficult proposition. For a long time many of the ministers of our Church had a desire to keep "Lizzie" in what they considered to be her

proper place—and would have none of Woman's Missionary organizations, otherwise the work of missions would be farther advanced in our Church.

The outstanding need of the Church to-day is missionary education, for man, woman, and child. The greatest problem of the Woman's Missionary Society is how to develop to a higher degree this educational work. If it be true that no nation rises above its womanhood, then the great task of giving the more abundant life of Christ to the women of every land is peculiarly the work of woman. Only by the most careful and thoughtful educating of the children of our own land, and the most prayerful laboring together with our splendid men, of whom we are the proud mothers, can we approach seriously this work which God has given us to do. Therefore, the following problems demand consideration from the Women's Missionary Society of General Synod:

1. That all the women of the Reformed Church see the necessity for a positive and active Christian life as against a negative and passive existence in the Church.

2. *a.* That all of our ministers urge the organization, for mission work, of the women and girls.

- b.* That the men and youth of each congregation be given the same opportunity for practical religious education along mission lines as the women and girls are having.

3. That students in our Theological Schools acquire a knowledge of the work being accomplished by the Women's Organizations in our Church so that they be able and willing to coöperate in every phase of Mission work, when they enter the active work of their profession.

4. A difficult problem, but not so serious as the others, is how to have many men of the Reformed Church appreciate the fact that the W. M. S. of General Synod has a great desire to aid every other organization in the Church and to coöperate to the fullest extent with all, but it desires also to rank as a distinct organization, taking its place amongst our other organizations and not as an appendage to any.

CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

II

UNIVERSALISM

ROLAND L. RUPP

At present there are four main eschatological ideas prevailing within the Christian Church:

1. *The Common Idea*: This idea presents the belief in a dual destiny. At death the vast majority of souls pass on to an irreversible doom to endless torment; this torment may be by nature either mental or physical, or both, and is of the most inexpressible intensity. The other portion of mankind, a small minority who have attained to the character of the saint, immediately at death, pass on to a state of eternal blessedness.

2. *Purgatory*: This is the view held by the Catholic Church. At death the soul passes not to heaven, the state of the blessed, nor to hell, the state of the accursed, but to purgatory, a place of purification and training where those souls whose guilt remains wholly or in part unatoned for may be gradually prepared for heaven by a period of suffering, either individual or vicarious.

3. *Conditional Immortality*: This idea is also known as Annihilationism. The wicked who persist in sin in spite of a disciplinary and retributive punishment, after a fair and just period of probation, and after they have so hardened themselves to all that is good and holy that there remains for them no longer any hope of recovery, are, because of the mercy of God, completely destroyed—both body and soul.

4. *Universalism*: There are also those who term this idea Restorationism. Universalism holds the doctrine that, because of the infinite love of God and the divine nature of man, all souls are ultimately saved.

In this thesis we are concerned only with the last one of these views. We have stated the others in order that while we are considering the details of Universalism we might see its different conceptions in all their relationships and contrasts with the other alternatives. Nor are we concerned here with the doctrine of Universalism as it may be found in the tenets of any given organized denomination. We can consider here merely the bald belief in Universalism as it has come down to us through the fruitful history of the Christian Church, and as that belief is now stated to the interested world, whether by the denomination that bears its name or by any other believer within or without the Christian Church. It is our purpose to make a brief historical statement, to state the belief before us clearly and concisely, and then to inquire into its merits so that we may intelligently value its claims upon the Christian believer.

I. A HISTORICAL STATEMENT

A belief in Universalism may be traced to the earliest period of the Christian Church. In fact, a vague belief in some form of natural immortality for all men lay within the mind and heart of most of the world's primitives. But here the forms of Christian Universalism alone shall detain us. In the early days of Christianity three general opinions seem to have prevailed concerning human destiny: the final annihilation of the wicked; the endless suffering of the wicked; and the final restoration of all men. Evidently the latter was considered as orthodox as the other two, for in no major heresy was the charge of Universalism ever included. The Gnostics held to this belief in part. It was written eloquently into that "pious fraud," the "Sibylline Oracles," which wielded a tremendous influence in the early Christian centuries. Clement of Alexandria, the great Origen, and the historian, Eusebius, considered this doctrine as one of the grand fruits of their faith in a sovereign God. During the fourth century, out of the six

theological schools then existing, four were teaching the "final restoration of all men" to their students. During the centuries that followed, a great host of faithful and learned men accepted this idea along with their more illustrious predecessors, among them we must mention John Scotus Erigena (810-877), beyond question the greatest thinker and scholar of the period. Later followed Albertus Magnus, concerning whom Neander testifies, "His great mind grasped the whole compass of human knowledge." This doctrine we find in the teachings of the Lollards of Germany, of the Albigenses and the Waldenses. The renowned Schleiermacher was pronounced and insistent in this faith, as were also a whole cluster of other famous German scholars. In England, William Law, Archbishop Tillotson, and Thomas Burnett head a long list of believers in Universalism. In America, finally, we come in touch with the founders of the Universalist Church—The Rev. James Rely, Elhanan Winchester, and John Murray. Dr. Joseph Priestly and Dr. Benjamin Rush were important figures in the doctrinal statement of this belief. Hosea Ballou was the genius of the Universalist Church and a scholar of influence in America's contribution to theological thought.

Thus we see that the belief in Universalism has had a long history, that it has been widely held, and that it has made a significant contribution to the life of the Christian Church. To-day believers in this doctrine are found in almost every denomination in Protestantism, especially among the more liberal wings. A still larger number do not profess Universalism as their settled convictions but hold it forth as their "eternal hope."

II. THE DOCTRINAL STATEMENT

Universalism is the "doctrine or belief that it is the purpose of God, through the grace revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ, to save every member of the human race from sin"

(Richard Eddy, in article "Universalism" in American Church History Series). Its contention is that evil is temporary in the human soul, that the good alone is permanent, and that God, therefore, is really and completely sovereign in this world.

1. *The Conception of God*: The whole doctrine of Universalism grows out of its God conception. God is *infinite* love. Love is the one word coming closer than any other in describing and connoting the nature of God. He is infinite in all His perfections—perfectly just, good, and wise. God is the Creator, and He is the eternal sovereign over what He has created. From the very beginning of creation one purpose has actuated Him in all His activities, that is, the purpose ultimately to win to His life of righteousness and love all His creatures whom He has created in His own image. The one instrument through which He can and will accomplish this purpose is His holy love. To this purpose God has given Himself and is devoting all His energies. To realize this purpose, however, God does not exert His omnipotent powers but works in conformity to His own laws, and through the free will with which He has endowed His children.

2. *The Conception of Christ*: Universalists differ in their Christologies. Various ideas have been held in history, and various ideas prevail to-day. Most modern Universalists reject the doctrine of the Trinity as traditionally handed down by the Church. Christ, however, must be placed in the category of the supernatural, in spite of the fact that his manifestations in time, and his works are in perfect accord with nature and reason. Most Universalists hold to the following: "As to the nature of Jesus, that it is identical to God's; as to his relationship, that it is that of a Son; as to his office, that it is mediatorial, *i.e.*, that he is the connecting link between humanity and God, that he is the way by which humanity is brought into the presence and fellowship with God" (E. H. Cappen, in Schaff's Reli-

gious Encyclopedia). Jesus was sent by God to be the Savior of the world—and he will ultimately save it, since God would not undertake, nor would Jesus accept, a mission that both knew would end in failure. But Jesus is also the son of man just as truly as he is the Son of God. He was a true human being. He had every attribute of the human. In sin alone he was different from his fellows; he was a perfect man, absolutely without sin. Nor was this sinlessness due to any abridgment of his humanity—it was the result of the exercise of a perfect moral choice—a power which is ours as well as his.

3. *The Conception of Man:* God created man in His own image. Man is the child of God by creation and destiny. He has been endowed with a real, though not unconditioned freedom—just as God exercises over His creation a real, though self-limited sovereignty. Man is a responsible, moral being. This moral sense distinguishes him from the rest of the creation. God has given to man all the necessary faculties to distinguish between right and wrong. Man is consciously responsible for his conduct, free to choose whatever he will in his moral alternatives. In these endowments lie the sources and the essence of sin. As soon as man chooses the wrong deliberately he places himself in an attitude of disobedience to God and His law. Sin is conditioned, first by the fact of man's freedom, and secondly by the fact that he knows that he is under law—the inexorable law of the moral universe over which God presides.

4. *The Conception of Salvation:* Salvation is deliverance from sin, unbelief, error, and temptation. It is not escape from punishment of sin. Salvation is a new birth, a thorough change of heart which takes place when a man, wrought upon by the grace of God, forsakes his sin and turns from his life of selfishness and indifference to God. "The initial element of salvation, and its very essence, as we conceive it, is the will to be saved" (Prof.

Tousey of Tufts College). In this manner the person enters into a larger fellowship with the Holy Spirit, he is quickened by a spiritual vitality, and is enabled to consecrate himself to a life of service and goodness. This new birth is not strictly supernatural or miraculous, it occurs in a natural spiritual way. It is accomplished by the Holy Spirit in His natural manner of work. Conversion marks the beginning of the Christian life. Regeneration is a gradual process.

5. *The Conception of Punishment*: The divine purpose of punishment is an essential part of the Universalist doctrine. Punishment is a natural consequence of sin. Since sin is a conscious disobedience of God, and punishment is an inevitable result of sin, punishment, therefore, becomes a corrective, a restraint, a schoolmaster and disciplinarian. For that very purpose God has eternally ordained it. Through it God reveals His will and His love to man. Penalty is an indispensable instrument in the divine government. It brings the subject to a recognition and performance of duty, and woos men from their derelictions. But as long as sin abounds, punishment must necessarily also abound. God's universe, since it is a moral order and God its complete sovereign, is a sphere where every disobedience and violation of law and love cannot escape punishment, for in this way God maintains His sovereignty over those who are not captivated by His love manifested in other ways. Thus punishment is not arbitrary or vindictive. "It is not designed to sooth the offended majesty of heaven. It is remedial. It reminds the offender that he is God's child and that he has broken God's law. He is not on trial in this life, to be handed over, if the verdict should be against him in the end, to a punishment that is remediless and hopeless; but he is under discipline and in a disciplinary state freedom remains. So long as man sins his chastisement will endure; but no form of punishment can destroy freedom. He may choose to sin as long

as he is willing to take sin and penalty together, but when he is moved to a different choice, the door of opportunity is open."¹ In this manner the divine government accomplishes its purpose—the development of moral personality through freedom. The history of the world is proof of its wisdom. Punishment always in the end finds its end. Man may persist through life in sin; his heart may be blackened and hardened, his soul may be blinded, but whatever he does, whatever he suffers, he is still the child of God. Men may sink to the lowest depth of degradation and despair, but always the spark of the divine exists within the soul—he cannot undo what God has done—and hope is as eternal as God.

6. *The Conception of Human Destiny:* The government of God is established not only over the narrow confines of this world; it is also projected forward into eternity. If God's purpose is not recognized in time, it must be recognized in eternity, but it is recognized, in both. God's government is perfect in its conception, and perfect in its justice. Further, it is built upon a foundation of perfect love, and from that love it draws its life and efficiency. In this world there live and die daily many heathen who have never known the Creator's love—they die blind, irresponsible, infants in soul. The world also bears forth idiots and imbeciles without reason, or conscience, or intelligence. Here dwell moral lepers, sinful wretches, selfish devils—consciously and unconsciously, all blinded to the truths and love of God. But they are all unfortunates, even in the eye of the just and discerning among men—unfortunates to whom the world was cold, cruel, mean, and fiendish. This fact drags into this thesis—for the reader to wrestle with—the general problem of evil. This problem this life cannot entirely solve. It is dragged bodily, along with bag and baggage, into the next world. The limitations of the world do not permit God at this time to realize his sovereignty fully here. The next world must

¹ E. H. Cappen, in Schoff's Religious Encyclopedia.

take up the work where it lapses here at death. In the world beyond the grave God, Christ, and men unite in the prosecution of the realization of the eternal purpose of God.

Death cannot determine the ultimate moral condition of humanity. Of course it must be a very powerful factor in the discipline and education of the soul. But it cannot change the nature of man, nor the disposition and character and purpose of God. While it can scarcely fail to change conceivably the whole condition and environment of the soul, nevertheless man will, no doubt, continue more or less in sin. Higher influences must work for redemption, but God will continue His love and His sovereignty, loving as truly when He punishes as when He blesses, not in anger, but in an intelligent and appealing love always going forth to win and to woo. Thus all things will be propelled forward toward the goal of final righteousness. Man's freedom cannot ultimately defeat the beneficent intentions of Deity, for that would be a poor sort of freedom which dooms men to endless sin. "Neither can the power of evil habit become so strong that it will be impossible for men any more to make effectual choice of the right; for that would be to contradict every theory upon which the recovery of souls is sought in this world; the uniform assumption being that no case is so desperate as to be beyond the saving efficacy of Infinite grace. Such a conclusion savors both of fatalism and atheism" (Dr. Cappen). With this faith in the ultimate infallibility of education, discipline, persuasion, and love for the accomplishment of their appointed tasks, all Universalists are confident that under the direction of the Infinite every man shall, of his own desire, in God's own time, will to be saved. "They see the whole creation, in one vast, resistless movement, sweeping toward the grand finality of universal holiness and love." Such shall be the works of God in time and in eternity.

These are the tenets of the Universalist. What shall we say relative to his claims? If his conclusions are too

sweeping to accord with our convictions, what error marks the point of his departure? Has this belief, which is as old as Christianity itself, any claim upon the intelligent believer?

III. A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

In a study of this doctrinal statement we are immediately impressed by three very evident facts: (1) The distinctive principles of Universalism are a direct protest against the common and popular opinions prevailing on these points. (2) Universalism has availed itself of all possible contributions by modern scholarship, especially in psychology, to give to its doctrine invulnerability against the attacks of science, whether theological, ethical, or historical. (3) Universalism is built squarely upon a Christian God-conception, and its theology is both theo-centric and Christo-centric.

In view of these facts this doctrine rests upon a foundation not easily shattered. Neither its scholarship, nor its Christianity can be attacked. Its fundamental postulates concerning God, Christ, man, sin, and salvation are identical with those of every scientific Christian theology. God is love, Creator and Providence, the Father of all men. Christ is Mediator and Savior. Men are the free children of God, who through a wrong choice, consciously made, have fallen into sin. Salvation is from sin and ignorance, and not from punishment, hell, or death. Surely there can be no defect in its fundamental postulates or conceptions.

1. *Its Unique Elements:* There are three main Christian doctrines in which the Universalist arrives at different conclusions from those who hold to other eschatologies. These differences are not due to any inherent objection to any of the major contentions of these doctrines, but solely to a shift in emphasis. We shall, therefore, briefly analyze these doctrines and note the points of departure:

On the idea of God the Universalist agrees with others in their Christian conception that in nature and character

God is Christ-like. Nor does he disagree, as is so commonly supposed, in his attitude regarding God's omnipotence. The believer in the restoration of all men does not hold that God exercises His omnipotence in any arbitrary or capricious manner in order to effect the salvation of all men. He rather delights in his recognition of the fact that God is limited by His own character and by His own created and established laws in His method of procedure. He certainly does delight in the dignity of man which is the result of God's self-limitation in order to endow man with a genuine freedom. This divine self-limitation is so real and so pronounced that all Universalists readily grant that man's freedom is constantly baffling and hindering God in His work of winning all souls to Himself. No, this is no theory, no conviction, no claim that God by an arbitrary omnipotent power saves men against their will. Even God Himself has no such power when His sovereignty clashes with the free minds of men. "Therefore it is clearly seen that the logic of Universalism does not rest so much upon the technical omnipotence of God, as upon—may I say it?—His common sense. We conceive that it would not at all be the part of common sense for the Creator so far to abdicate the throne of His kingdom that undisciplined subjects might bring on a reign of interminable anarchy, and finally defeat His most cherished designs. If the conception of the absolute omnipotence of God is unworkable and absurd, I submit that the absolute unconditioned freedom of man is even more so" (Prof. Tousey). Therefore we cannot mistake in this respect, that Universalism's point of departure is the idea of the omnipotence of God, but rather it takes place with its conception of *God's purpose and the power of His love. Universalism, in essence, is nothing more than an emphatic contention that it is the purpose of God to save all men, either here or hereafter, and that the love of God is sufficiently appealing to the better natures of men to accomplish these divine desires.* Believers in other

doctrines of human destiny differ only in their faith in God's love to accomplish this tremendous miracle, or—as they state it, which in fact is the same thing—they believe that the nature of many men will in the end become so hardened and blinded by persistent sin that the love of the Father will no longer make an appeal to their spiritual senses. The difference is clearly a contention about the scope of God's purpose of salvation and about the inherent and dynamic power of His love.

The second doctrine on which conclusions differ is the Doctrine of Man. On this point the believer in universal salvation is flagrantly misunderstood. He does not deny human freedom, he emphatically affirms it. But he does object most strenuously to the implication of the unconditioned freedom of man. And to this objection every psychologist and every student of the Social Sciences lends his voice. No intelligent observer of life would claim for man such arbitrary freedom. God did not carelessly thrust upon man what He denied to Himself for purely moral reasons. This fact, then, leads us directly to our second point of departure. Only an absolute freedom exercised by the human mind, noting all the implications that such an idea conveys, could bring about the possibility of that utter or "total human depravity," or "hardening"—as some prefer to term it—against which the love of a Heavenly Father and His eternal purpose to save all men—which must be His purpose in the nature of the case, if He is the Father of all men—would merely shatter and spend itself. *No, the faith in universal salvation is the exact negation and antithesis of every idea of total human depravity, or hardening.* But let us not be misunderstood—we freely agree with the psychologist that character tends to fixity, and we accept as a scientific fact the laws governing the formation of habit. Only a superficial student however would rest content with those conclusions, for in themselves they furnish no explanation, no final solution, no spiritual reason. In the religious and

spiritual world we must always penetrate beyond the strata of science. Life is far deeper than law. Our experience and faith must carry us beyond the observation and assertion of this law; we must see that this law of character formation is merely relative, not final and absolute. There is a moral reason for the law. We constantly see in life men who have been recalled from the utmost conceivable depravity to a life of princely character. Our faith does not permit us to believe that any creature, created in God's image, any child of God with a God-given freedom, is able to wander so far from the Father's house that he would be entering realms where the love of the Father is not manifested; nor can we believe that he could eternally so blind himself, poison himself, as to destroy for all time every spark of the Source and Power of his life. More overwhelming yet, there presents itself the indisputable fact that this law governing the formation of habit and character is a divine and benevolent law as are all the rest of God's laws. Instead of condemning, yea, damning the child to eternal sin and misery, to torture and annihilation, it is an effective aid to salvation. Its very power is a deterrent, a warning, an eternal watchman, pointing out to the violator the dangers of continued transgression. This law, instead of being tyrannical, crushing, merciless, is one of God's most beneficent instruments in the redemption of the sinner, because it is divinely intended to prevent exactly that thing which the opponents of universal salvation claim it accomplishes. Sincere believers must learn that it never is sufficient to treat scientific facts from the viewpoint of science alone. God is not a monster psychologist. There is purpose in every psychological law—even as there was in Calvary—but faith is needed to detect it.

The third doctrine in which the Universalist arrives at a different conclusion is, of course, that of Human Destiny. Here the point of departure is *the faith in the extent of the divine salvation*. Universalism says: Given the God Whom

we have, accepting the statement of religious faith that He is good, that we are created in His image, and that the order in which we live is friendly, and further, accepting the statement of science that the universe in which we live is reasonable, we can arrive at no other moral conclusion but that ultimately all men will be transformed into the image of that which is immortal. Universal Salvation is the only possible result for a God like the One the Universalists worship—anything else, even the loss of one soul from among that mighty aggregation of the ages, would be out of harmony with the character they ascribe to Him. The one who has persisted in sin the longest, who has fallen the lowest, needs God the most. Jesus never despaired of anyone, and for God to despair of the one who is helplessly in the grip of sin would destroy His very right to be God—yes, it would be self-destruction for the Infinite. Any such idea is too preposterous to be entertained. Thus the distinctive element is not that of a belief in a continued probation after death, nor that punishment both here and in future worlds is primarily disciplinary and reformatory, neither that, as is so frequently and wrongly claimed, the God of the Universalists compels men to be saved—which is by itself a contradiction in terms—but rather, *that sometime in the long eternity God's purpose will be ultimately realized, that all men will respond to His love, and that His sovereignty is no eternal fiction.* In the end the disciplinary and educational measures exercised by the sovereign Father will be efficacious to the uttermost. It matters not how long the sinner has been sinning, nor into how many of God's realms he has been carrying his blackened soul, the moral government of God always followed him there. But what matters is that finally that soul will say, in the words of the prodigal, "I will arise and go to my father"—he will voluntarily, by the exercise of his free choice, throw off the shackles of sin and yield his will to the Father's—he will arise, in the power given to him sometime in the dim past, with the words "I will," in answer to the

eternal "Thou shalt." The all-important thing is not when the development is completed, but that it is completed.

2. *Its Difficulties:* The major objection to Universalism is the assertion that its conclusions are a denial, if not destructive of all the legitimate implications of freedom. They maintain that freedom implies responsibility, and that a persistent violation of this freedom will sooner or later cut all the divine threads that bind the soul and immortality. Here is a partial truth whose conclusion is not warranted by its premises. This supposed difficulty appears to be a cloud in the mind of the critic. Genuine freedom implies responsibility—most certainly. But no man can undo what God has done. What the critic thinks is God's end we assert to be God's means. Immortality is a natural gift of God to man. It is a part of man's working capital bestowed by a wise and beneficent God. What God has freely given men need not struggle to attain. Immortality—yes, eternity has been bestowed upon man along with a genuine moral freedom as a part of the endowment necessary for the realization of God's end. God's end for every soul is not an abstract or technical immortality, but a Christ-like character. This is the end of the moral struggle. Freedom is the instrument by means of which that character is attained, and immortality of spirit has been benevolently added in order that no soul, cursed by the accident of malevolent birth or environment, might be held from achieving that which is God's supreme desire.

Salvation is not immortality; salvation is life in communion and fellowship with the Heavenly Father—both in time and in eternity. Here is where freedom enters and reigns. Salvation is the will to be saved. The will is the key that unlocks the door to God. There can be no salvation except where there is complete responsibility. A moral choice is a free choice, free to choose on the side of evil or on the side of righteousness. But every sinful choice means alienation from God, a spurning of His love, a pain in His

heart. For the perpetrator it means weakness and corruption, misery and retribution for his discipline. Every choice for the right brings God closer to the soul, into a more intimate fellowship and sympathy. On the one side there is room for unspeakable degradation and woe, on the other for infinite growth, and eternity is not too long to exhaust it.

Character developed under such a condition of freedom is the character that will stand every test of God. This is the greatest freedom possible that man can conceive—to choose the right here and now, knowing that he has all eternity before him to turn from his sinful life but choosing the right because he knows that it is God's will that he choose the right. The choice is made under no immediate threat of doom or torment or annihilation. It is made because of its immediate value. Such a man lives eternally in the present, and what he does he does because he wills to do it. Such a choice is majestic in its conception. There is in it no taint of duress or threat or force or fear. Every personality developed under such a condition is a genuine personality. Every salvation coming to the soul through the exercise of such a freedom is a real and genuine salvation. Alongside of this freedom the freedom of the critic of Universalism crumbles and shrivels. No, God does not compel men to be saved. There is no compulsory salvation. God has given to man the faculties, the environment, and the time necessary for his salvation, but his salvation he achieves with that help that God reaches forth always to the will that wills to be saved.

This difficulty seems not to rise out of the problem of moral freedom, but out of the problem of immortality. Although the realistic metaphysics, in which natural immortality has had its origin, has been discredited, nevertheless we are compelled to cling to this belief. We may not have any metaphysical proof for such an exalted claim for the human soul—nor do we wish for any—but the consensus of all mankind supports it. All the facts and signs and inferences of this life eloquently support it. Scientists tell us

that matter is indestructible. It is a very grave suspicion upon any theologian's faith to assert that the soul, or that which is spiritual, is any less indestructible. The purpose of life is the development of character, and it is a very imperfect specimen, even at the very best, that these few score years can carve. Certainly God, always with an eye and purpose for moral perfection, will not be satisfied with what is even unsatisfactory to men.

The second difficulty that usually arrests the attention of the critic of this belief is that it demands a bold faith on the part of the one holding it. Human nature and the average life seem to argue against such a dazzling ideal. But the man of faith is also a man of tremendous insight; he trusts in man because he trusts in God. In any doctrine of "last things" we cannot be mathematically certain about anything, we may however have stronger proof than syllogistic argument or metaphysical postulates. The greatness of any belief of this type is its profound faith in God and man. We believe that man's highest aspirations have their fulfillment in God's wisdom and love. We have already seen man's power of recovery in action. Daily the prodigal returns to the father's house. The manner in which Jesus dealt with the moral leper and outcast gives us substantial ground for faith. But we are always driven to God for our final assurance. God, Who is infinite love and justice, would not impose upon finite creatures a law infinite in its demands and penalties; He would not impose eternal tortures for a few score years of spurned love; He would not blast the eternal hopes of men, and rob them of the highest gift He had originally bestowed by giving to them a nature that could by temporary indulgence be permanently brought to nought.

3. *Its Merits:* We must content ourselves here with a bare catalog of those points in this faith that make a tremendous appeal to the writer:

First, its God conception is satisfactory and adequate. We can believe only in a God Who is the Father of all men, Who is Christ-like in character, and completely sovereign in

His universe. He must satisfy the best in us, and call forth infinitely more than we feel we shall be ever able to do.

Secondly, its conception of man is inspiring and satisfactory. We must believe in the divinity of every man, or else deny in us the image of the God Who created us.

Thirdly, it conceives life and the universe as a unity. It is the only eschatological conception that satisfies our modern evolutionary viewpoint. The developmental process of this world is continued in the next. The universe must be a moral unified order. The Kingdom of God, which Christ taught would ultimately embrace all mankind in this world, will surely not be any less universal in the larger life beyond the grave.

Lastly, it is a profound faith—a faith in the final conquest of the right. It is a pioneer faith that only the good has positive value, that evil is temporary and negative—that God is truly sovereign and finally will be “all in all.”

IV. A FINAL STATEMENT

The writer is conscious of his inadequate treatment of the problems involved in the subject of this thesis. It might be of interest to explain why he cannot accept any of the other eschatological ideas. Our God-conception denies any such belief. God is not a monster Who tortures His children in hell fire as the believer in a dual destiny would affirm; nor does he listen to the ceremonial importunities of men to lift souls out of purgatory; nor is God the universal hangman that the annihilationist believes Him to be—a mighty healer of broken hearts and souls who gives “death doses” to those patients whom he cannot heal. All such conceptions seem to be hostile to any teachings of a Christ-like God. The writer surely is not able to ascribe them to Him. Of course, we shall not permit our enthusiasm to compel us to dogmatize this contention. The individual religious experience is far too sacred for such an encroachment. But certainly no one would deny to another the

privilege to think only noble thoughts concerning the God Whom he worships, and in this conception we find and satisfy our highest thoughts and aspirations concerning God, man and the world. The only God that we can worship—thanks to all the revelations of God by men of the past—is the Christ-like and sovereign God Who did not create His children to remain fools eternally, and Who created a universe which does not permit its moral gains to be destroyed by spiritual atrophy.

With those whose experience does not accord with ours we will not remonstrate—unless they say that God is not love, that Christ is not Savior, and that this world is not worthy of the creation of a Christ-like and infinitely wise God. Any conclusion not hostile to such fundamental postulates will defy all opposition. But we must not be asked to accept a God Who himself violates the best and holiest in the human heart, and Whose love is not sufficient for all men—not sufficient to grant forgiveness when they would return in penitence to His love. No, our God must not despair of His own creation, or else we would have to say with the African farmer, "I love Jesus Christ, but I hate God." *But give us the God of Jesus Christ, and we shall be satisfied.* We can love and adore and worship Him, because we can believe in the final omnipotence of His love, in the complete sovereignty of His reign, and in the perfect wisdom of His creation. We believe that His love will accomplish all things, that in Him finally all men will find their life and eternal blessedness. Give us that God. But do not ascribe to Him any longer the medieval characteristics, the characteristics that cannot be found in our Christian God. Anything less than this will compel us to accept a universal dualism, both here and hereafter—a dualism eternal and horrible, which would turn life into a hideous nightmare and the world into a foul, putrid, terrible pit; and the future life might be—anything horrible, nothing better than the Divine Comedy of Dante—or worse.

SHAMOKIN, PA.

III

PAUL'S VIEW OF THE PERSON AND WORK OF CHRIST

HENRY S. GEHMAN

It is frequently asserted that the theology of the Christian Church has been Pauline instead of Christian and that consequently the true teaching of Jesus has been obscured; that this theology has given the Church since the Reformation the tendency to indulge in meaningless doctrinal verbiage which has no connection with practical life and which does not give the modern man the proper help in solving his spiritual problems. There is a popular impression that St. Paul in amplifying the message and meaning of Christ superimposed a theology which aims to reconcile a new pharisaism and legalism with the free spirit of Jesus. A reading of the Epistles of St. Paul, however, reveals to us the fact that the apostle made no attempt to found a theology or a system of thought. He has in fact no definite theology, but from his letters we can form a comprehensive view of his doctrine in its plastic and vivid unity as expressing the convictions of a man who had found salvation in living fellowship with Jesus Christ.

St. Paul's Christology is based on the experience of the glorified Lord vouchsafed to him in the hour of his conversion. He does not state that he had ever seen or heard Jesus while the latter was on earth; naturally he had heard about the work and tenets of the Galilean, and during his stay of fifteen days with Peter (Gal. 1, 18) he must have learned a great deal about the Saviour. But in spite of what he may have acquired from his pagan, Jewish, and Christian contemporaries, his apostleship is based upon his conversion which he narrates as having been vivid, super-

natural, and irresistible (Acts 22, 5-14; 26, 11-18). In this vision he had received a personal call to preach the gospel as he reiterates in his letters (I Cor. 1, 17; Gal. 1, 1). This experience of the glorified Lord lent his words authority (I Cor. 9, 1) and is the living and dynamic center of his life's work; his devotion to Jesus is always characterized by intensity and passion.

From his knowledge of the Scriptures Paul is convinced (Acts 18, 28; 28, 23) that Jesus is the Messiah or Christ. His mode of thinking is, at the basis, Hebraic, and when he uses the title Son of God (*e.g.*, Rom. 1, 9; II Cor. 1, 19, et al.), we must understand it as synonymous with Messiah coupled with the idea of the Greek Logos. It is interesting to observe that he does not employ the Hebrew term Son of Man. In accordance with the current view of his time, he believed in a preëxistent Christ; he always or nearly always touches on this subject in a quite incidental manner, since the idea of preëxistence was so familiar in his day that it required no explanation. It was part of God's eternal plan to save the world through the Christ; thus we note: Eph. 3, 11, "According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord"; II Tim. 1, 9, "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began"; cf. also Gal. 4, 4 and Titus 1, 2.

The fulness of the Godhead bodily dwelt (Col. 2, 9) in this preëxistent Christ, who by virtue of His Divinity consequently was the Creator of everything: Col. 1, 16-17, "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Yet we must bear in mind that Paul means not the historic Jesus, but the transcendental Christ, who was the Creator.

Sometimes, especially in benedictions, he utters God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ as coördinate. A few examples will suffice by way of illustration: Col. 1, 2, "Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ"; Eph. 6, 23, "Peace be to the brethren and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."

Nevertheless, although Christ is closely associated with the Father, God is superior to Christ. The greatness of the Christ was dependent after all upon the will of God and the Son was subordinate. Thus we note: Rom. 8, 32, "He that spared not his own Son"; Rom. 15, 6, "God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ"; I Cor. 3, 23, "Christ is God's"; I Cor. 11, 3, "The head of Christ is God"; Col. 1, 19, "For it was the good pleasure of the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell." This subordination of Christ was in his view compatible with His having a place within the sphere of Godhead. It was a subjection by which the unity of God was exhibited, not destroyed. Jesus, the historic Jesus, is the Christ, but He is not the preëxistent Christ. The divine nature had projected itself into the human; Jesus is the Christ, and yet Paul could apply the titles Son of God, Lord, and Christ to either conception of the Christ in an inclusive sense without any apparent contradiction. Paul may not be clear as to a distinction between God and God the Father, but in his mind there is no confusion between Christ and the historic Jesus.

Jesus was human, but the Divine was resident in Him. Paul informs us that Jesus was human (Rom. 8, 3; 9, 5; Phil. 2, 7), born of a woman (Gal. 4, 4), of the seed of David by natural descent (Acts 13, 23; Rom. 1, 3; II Tim. 2, 8). This he considers (Rom. 15, 12) as a fulfillment of prophecy: "And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust." When Paul in II Cor. 8, 9 states: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,

that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich," he does not refer to the poverty and hardships endured by Jesus, but he means that it was a condescension on the part of God to become incarnate in a human body. In this connexion it may not be amiss to quote another verse, Rom. 1, 4: "And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Was Jesus the Christ only after His resurrection? In view of the other passages from Paul, there was no deification of Jesus; He was Christ from the day He was born, but the resurrection was a part of His Messianic work to prove that He is the Christ and that His sonship might be fully and actually manifested.

In his preaching Paul taught (Acts 13, 28 ff.) that Jesus was crucified and buried, that He was resurrected and ascended into heaven (Rom. 8, 34). He also intimates that He had descended into Sheol, Eph. 4, 9-10: "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended. . . ."

In Paul's view the Lordship of Christ first came to its full reality at His exaltation to the right hand of God. It is a glory superior to His preëxistent life. Paul was a Hebrew, but he was influenced by a Greek environment, and to make his point clear to the followers of Stoicism, Gnosticism, and other philosophies, he had to present a Christ who would be intelligible to his hearers and readers. We have seen how he gives a cosmological exposition of the preëxistent Christ as the Creator. Likewise he treats the ascended Christ from the same point of view. Now He is free from the limitations of the life in the flesh, and He can give untrammelled and complete expression to His proper Sonship. Thus writes the apostle, Eph. 1, 19 ff.: "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power toward us who believe, according to the working of his mighty

power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." Also in Philippians 2, 9 ff. he writes: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." In Philippians 3, 21 he tells us that the ascended Christ is able to subdue all things unto Himself, and in Ephesians 1, 21 quoted above, we noted that Christ is the Lord of all powers in the universe both in this age and in the world to come. In other words just as all creation began in Him, so the whole cosmogony moves toward Him until it finds its fulfillment in, and union with, Him (Eph. 1, 10). This condition is represented as being the reward God has bestowed upon Him for His voluntary sacrifice (Phil. 2, 9). Here St. Paul apparently identifies God and God the Father; yet it could not be otherwise than that Christ should attain this exalted position, since He is God and always has been God.

Paul is convinced that Jesus is the Messiah, but that His work is still unfinished. Accordingly he shared with the early community of Christians the belief that Jesus would return to earth to complete His Messianic task. Thus he speaks of "the day of our Lord Jesus Christ," "the day of the Lord Jesus," "the day of Christ," "the day of Jesus Christ," and also uses other references to that momentous occasion (I Cor. 1, 7; II Cor. 1, 14; Col. 3, 4; Phil. 1, 6; 2, 16; I Thess. 1, 10; 2, 19; 3, 13; II Thess. 2, 1; I Tim. 6, 14). In fact he expected the *παρουσία* to happen soon (I Cor. 7, 29 ff.), and in view of this expectation, he gently, but not insistently advises that it is not worth

while for the unmarried to enter into the state of matrimony. We may wonder what his ideas were about the second coming of Christ, but we can be reasonably sure that he believed in a visible and bodily return of Christ. We may make all due allowance for figurative language when he writes, I Thess. 4, 16-17: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord"; but, after all, we cannot refuse believing that Paul expected a thrilling event. The apostle who had experienced such a supernatural conversion and had been "caught up to the third heaven" (II Cor. 12, 2-5) could readily conceive of the marvelous.

Since Paul looks to Christ equally with God for all things in the present and the future, he represents both Christ and God as judge at the end of the present order without any sense of a painful problem, much less a contradiction, since Christ is merely one phase of God, but not identical with the Father. Although we shall see the larger and more original aspect of his teaching in later paragraphs, let us note here in passing that Paul could not entirely shake off his forensic ideas. We shall all, asserts the Apostle, stand before the judgment seat of Christ (Acts 17, 31; Rom. 14, 10; II Cor. 5, 10) so "that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." According to II Tim. 4, 1, the judgment will take place at the second coming, while in Romans 2, 16 he represents God as the judge. This latter statement causes no confusion in the light of the fact that Christ is God.

In his writings St. Paul interpreted to the world for all times the meaning of Christ. He did not intend to compose a work of systematic theology, and many of his ideas

may not be sharply defined. His teaching was primarily religious, and his message of salvation which was so real and vivid to him overshadows everything else in his Epistles. I Tim. 1, 15, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief."

Paul knows that Christ came to save sinners, but when it came to explain how the process was accomplished, he encountered some difficulties. All men have sinned and no one can fulfill the whole law. How can one obtain the sentence of justification or acquittal, *i.e.*, the judgment that he is righteous in God's sight? We observe that Paul saw an intimate connection between justification and the death of Christ. This is stated again and again (*e.g.*, Rom. 5, 9-10; I Cor. 5, 7; Gal. 1, 4; Eph. 2, 13; Col. 1, 14; 1, 20-22; I Tim. 2, 5-6, et al.). Christ paid a penalty in order that man may live. The justification of sinners was made possible by God through the death of Christ, though the death is not emphasized in such a way as to exclude all the other aspects of Christ's work from their proper share in the justifying effect. The idea of substitution is touched upon but not emphasized. When we read, I Cor. 5, 7, "Christ our paschal lamb has been sacrificed," we may probably dismiss it by saying that Paul employs figurative language. When in Gal. 1, 4, Paul says: "(Christ) who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father," we have no right to assume a sacrificial meaning. But in Col. 1, 14, there is a hint at a sacrifice: "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." The idea of expiation is involved in the context of Romans 5, 8-9 and 8, 3, and the doctrine of vicarious suffering with the specific kind of death is found in Gal. 3, 13: "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." It may be advanced that man had to

be purchased free from sin, for in I Tim. 2, 6 Paul states that Christ Jesus gave Himself as a ransom for all. There is no doubt that the apostle suggests a vicarious atonement, but this is no reason for making it the fundamental principle of St. Paul's doctrine of justification. Rashdall very aptly remarks: "St. Paul seems led into it, as it were against his will by the necessities of the argument." Against the idea that Paul was definitely committed to the substitutionary theory, we must bear in mind that he never uses the proposition *ἀντί*, but always *ὑπέρ* in this connection. The latter theory that the merit earned by a voluntary death of the divine Son was so transcendent that it could earn the pardon of sinners as of right is not perhaps far off from the thought of St. Paul in some places, but it is never actually elaborated. Before we proceed, let us state, however, that the apostle maintains in no mistakable terms that reconciliation with God is effected through the death of Christ (Rom. 5, 10-11; II Cor. 5, 18-19; Eph. 2, 13-16; Col. 1, 20-22); if he cannot explain it by any clear-cut and definite theory, he is positive that it is a fact on account of his personal experience.

The death of Christ was a part of His saving programme (Rom. 5, 6, et al.), which St. Paul considered a fulfillment of the Scriptures (I Cor. 15, 3). In other words it was a part of His Messianic work, but not in a political sense. The Hebrew Messiah was supposed to establish a Jewish state, but Paul has extended the meaning of the title to mean the Son of God, the Logos, whose mission is to found a spiritual kingdom which consists (Rom. 14, 17) of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. In order to show that He is the Messiah He had to die, and inasmuch as death could not hold Him, He thereby proved Himself to be the Christ (Acts 17, 3). By virtue of His being the first born from the dead, He showed that He is God and has attained preëminence over all (Col. 1, 18). In the presence of Agrippa (Acts 26, 23) Paul succinctly

states the Messianic mission: "That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people, and to the Gentiles."

The resurrection was the greatest event in the life of Christ and made a powerful and convincing impression on Paul. He mentions the ascension (Eph. 4, 8) of Christ and refers to His power over all the cosmological forces, but he does not cease speaking of the resurrection (*e.g.*, Acts 13, 30-31; Rom. 6, 9; 14, 9; II Cor. 4, 14). It is the one indisputable fact which marks Jesus as the Christ, the redeemer of all men (Rom. 15, 12), the founder of a kingdom where (Col. 3, 11) "there is neither Greek nor Jew, nor circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all." The resurrection of Jesus from the dead is the foundation or at least the most tangible starting point of Paul's teaching; without it there is no Christ, and no hope. Cf. I Cor. 15, 12-25.

Paul's two important works, the Epistle to the Romans and that to the Galatians, are the great exponents of the incontrovertible truth that we cannot fulfill the law. If a man tries to fulfill the law and fails in one part of it, the law has been broken. It is not a question of what per cent. of the law he has kept; the fact remains that we have broken the law, and so no one can be justified by the works of the law: Rom. 7, 24-25: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord"; I Cor. 15, 57, "But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Paul has no doubt that Jesus is the Christ, and so he can enunciate the great universal principle that we are justified only through our faith in Jesus Christ. God forgives sins for Christ's sake (Eph. 4, 32), for the believers in Christ are not under the law, but under grace (Rom. 6, 14). "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom.

6, 23). Every one who believes in Jesus Christ can be saved (Rom. 10, 12-13). Although Christianity has its background in Judaism, it is not required that the Gentile should pass through the intermediate stage of becoming a Jew before he can be a Christian. For the believer Christ is everything; He is the end of the law for righteousness (Rom. 10, 4); He is wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption (I Cor. 1, 30).

Those who are under the law and try to fulfill it and thereby become righteous, are under a curse, while the just shall live by faith (Rom. 1, 17; Gal. 3, 10). The children of God enjoy a glorious liberty (Rom. 8, 21). "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law" (Gal. 3, 21). Quotations and examples could be multiplied to show that by the works of the law no one can be justified and that we are saved only through the grace of God through our faith in Jesus Christ. In fact when St. Paul preaches justification by faith, he maintains that he is proclaiming no new doctrine, but is reasserting a principle which is older than the law; for Abraham (Rom. 4, 3) believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness; this faith, he points out, was reckoned to Abraham before the circumcision (Rom. 4, 10).

Faith in Christ naturally implies an intellectual acceptance of Him as the Messiah: Rom. 10, 9, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead thou shalt be saved." We must actually believe that Jesus is the Christ, that He died for us, and that He again rose from the dead; but that is not all. This faith implies a love for Jesus and a fond trust in Him as the Christ. Paul makes no attempt to rationalize this faith in Christ which produces salvation. The apostle is satisfied with his conversion, he knows that it is real and that he is saved. He speaks (I Cor. 2, 14-16) of the foolishness of the natural man, while the believers

have the mind of Christ. When he is weak (II Cor. 12, 9) from the standpoint of worldly wisdom, then he is strong. He is willing (I Cor. 4, 10) to be a fool for Christ's sake, because the believers in Christ are wise spiritually. To them that perish, the preaching of the cross is foolishness (I Cor. 1, 18), but unto them who are saved, it is the power of God. Salvation through Jesus Christ is a fact, an experience, and a joy, and Paul is content with his inner condition without being able to give a scientific explanation. For this reason he can thank God *in* and *through Christ* or *in His name*, and he can do all things *through Christ* (Phil. 4, 13). He lived in absolute dependence upon Christ, and for him Christ is everything (I Cor. 2, 2; 3, 11).

The relation between Christ and the spirit of God is not identity, but vital unity. The person who died upon the cross, and rose again, and will come again to judgment, is nowhere called *Spirit*, but Christ gives the Spirit in His fulness. We find in the Epistles a living correlation of Christ and the Spirit as they are manifested in experience. Not merely are the phenomena of the Spirit a decisive proof of Christ's Messianic position, but the presence of the Spirit as a fact of power in the believing life is a self-communication of the Lord who as a Spirit dominates the new order of being into which the believers in Christ have been translated. This Spirit dwells in the believer, and whoever has not the Spirit of Christ is none of His (Rom. 8, 9).

Paul relies upon the proof supplied by the Spirit and its power (I Cor. 2, 5); the divine secret or mystery of Christ (Eph. 3, 3-9) is a part of the mysterious wisdom of God, that hidden wisdom which God decreed from all eternity for our glory (I Cor. 2, 7). Through faith there is a certain mystical relation whereby Christ dwells in the heart of the believer (Eph. 3, 17). The phrases *in Christ* or *in the Lord* occur nearly two hundred-forty times in the Epistles. "To be in union with Christ," "putting on the Lord Jesus Christ," "to have Christ in us," "to have the Spirit of Christ

or the Spirit of God" to all intents and purposes mean the same thing. Every one of these conditions is attained through faith. Through faith the believer is grafted into a mystic union with Christ just as twigs are grafted on to a tree (Rom. 11, 16 ff.). Again this mystic bond referring to the whole community is expressed by the statement that Christ is the body of which the believers in Him are members (I Cor. 6, 15; 12, 12; 12, 27). We meet the same idea when Paul asserts that Christ's body is the Church (Rom. 12, 4 ff.; Col. 1, 18) or that Christ is the head of the Church (Eph. 5, 23). Paul sees in the Holy Communion some mystical relation with Christ (I Cor. 10, 16-17) which, however, will work to one's condemnation if he partake of it unworthily (I Cor. 11, 29).

Faith in Christ is not only an abstract intellectualism, nor is the fellowship with Christ merely the dream of a poet. A genuine faith in Christ produces results in the life of the believer. It implies a spiritual enrichment (I Cor. 1, 5), the believer's life is hidden with Christ in God and Christ is his life (Col. 3, 3-4). It means that his life is identified with Christ's; being made free from sin, he is the servant of righteousness (Rom. 6, 18). Christians, as servants of Christ, perform the will of God, not under compulsion, but from the heart (Eph. 6, 6). As a result of faith the Christian becomes like Christ (II Cor. 3, 18); he strips off the old nature and puts on the new nature which is renewed in the likeness of its Creator (Eph. 4, 22; Col. 3, 10). The fruits of the Spirit are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, righteousness, and truth (Gal. 5, 22-23; Eph. 5, 9). Those who believe in Christ are not servants; they have received the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry "Abba Father" (Rom. 8, 15). Cf. in this connection Gal. 4, 6. This figure of legal adoption is used to set forth the idea of moral regeneration.

It may, in passing, also be remarked that the death of

Christ is a type of the process that takes place when the individual dies unto sin. Because Christ died, each believer may be considered to have really died also (II Cor. 5, 14). In accepting the Saviour and renouncing sin, it is as though the believer were crucified with Christ (Gal. 2, 20; 5, 24; 6, 14). The whole human race is summed up in Christ, and in the act of spiritual surrender there is an emotional unity or identification with Christ at baptism: Rom. 6, 3, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" Cf. Col. 2, 12. In this connection let us quote Rashdall: "The constructive death through participation in this actual death of Christ had satisfied the law's claims on the sinner." The resurrection of Christ from the dead is not only a pledge of our resurrection (I Cor. 15), but it is also a type of what takes place in the believer's heart when he is raised to newness of life (Rom. 6, 4; Col. 2, 12, et al.).

A few passages from St. Paul make us feel that in his mind the character, example, and teaching of Jesus—particularly His moral teaching—were much more powerful and important than is generally supposed. Jesus was the ideal man: Phil. 2, 5, "Let this be in you, which was in Christ Jesus." Paul in Rom. 15, 1-5 says that the Christians should go out of their way to help others and not be selfish, for Christ did not please Himself; that they should be likeminded one toward another according to Christ Jesus. It is the Spirit, however, which keeps the Christian in the path or morality: Gal. 5, 16, "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh."

It is also important to add that according to Paul Christ not only lives in the believer and grants him His Spirit, but that at God's right hand He actually pleads for us (Rom. 8, 34). In the twenty-seventh verse of the same chapter he states that the Spirit pleads before God for the saints. This is no contradiction, since both the Christ and the Spirit are of the same essence.

In conclusion let us repeat that according to St. Paul salvation is found only through faith: I Cor. 16, 22, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maranatha." In his spiritual fervor he writes, Romans 8, 35 ff.: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?... For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Of such a believing soul the constant prayer is (Phil. 3, 9-10) to "be found in him, not having my own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness, which is of God by faith; that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." A careful study of the Epistles convinces us that Paul wrote from his own spiritual experiences and that we cannot understand Christ without these Letters; the apostle is not the legalist, not the Pharisee, but the greatest exponent of Jesus Christ through whom we are saved from sin and death.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

IV

"CHRISTIAN WAYS OF SALVATION"

THEODORE F. HERMAN

In this issue of the REVIEW we devote the space given to notices of new books to an appreciation of a recent volume published by The Macmillan Company.¹ We do this not merely because its author is a co-editor of this magazine, personally known to most of our readers and widely known throughout our more immediate household of faith. The intrinsic worth of the volume entitles it to the careful consideration of all thoughtful people who are interested in the Christian religion, be they clergymen or laymen. The writer desires, by means of this comprehensive notice and analysis, to induce every reader of it to become the owner of the book. No professional skill and no technical training are required to enjoy Professor Richards' work, and to appropriate its treasures. Though he deals with historical, theological, and philosophical issues that are difficult, he presents them so clearly that no adult intelligence can fail to grasp his meaning.

Another volume, similar in spirit, was published by Dr. E. E. Kresge, Ph.D., a few weeks before *Christian Ways of Salvation*. We gave it brief mention in our January issue (The Church and the Ever-Coming Kingdom of God), but we desire, in our next number, to give our

¹*Christian Ways of Salvation*. Lectures delivered before Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y., on The Russell Foundation, Easter Week, 1922. By George W. Richards, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pp. ix + 327. Price \$2.50. The book may be secured from the Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church, 15th and Race Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.

readers an appreciative analysis of the contents of this noteworthy contribution to the literature on the social significance of Christianity. The writer feels that the appearance of these two volumes, in rapid succession, marks a new era in the literature of the Reformed Church. No two books of like character and caliber have been published in our denomination since the fathers laid down their pens. They are not less scholarly and scientific than the best works of the past. And they breathe the spirit of a new age. Building on the foundations laid by those who have gone before us, they explain, elucidate, and inspire the Christian faith for to-day.

In this issue we consider the last of these two volumes because, logically, it comes first. It furnishes the antecedents and historical foundations of Dr. Kresge's discussions. Together, these scholarly works interpret the meaning of Christian Salvation in its individual and social aspects, as it runs back into primeval ages and looks forward to new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

The author of *Christian Ways of Salvation*, George W. Richards, D.D., LL.D., requires no further introduction to our readers. He is Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa., and President of the institution. He has been a student and teacher of the Christian Religion for more than two decades. And he came to his position in the Seminary from a successful pastorate in one of the largest parishes of the Reformed Church. Accordingly, he writes as a teacher and preacher, which is a rare achievement. With a steadfast aim and a sure step he can thread his way through the labyrinthine confusion of theology and religion.

There are many books on theology, written by pundits and crammed with accurate knowledge, which lack totally that wisdom which is withheld from the prudent and given to the simple. They starve the heart and soul of man be-

cause they sever theology from human experience, which is its fontal source. In their pedantic hands the Trinity becomes a mathematical puzzle, instead of being the interpretation of a personal faith in the infinite fulness of the redemptive love of God. And Salvation is described as a "plan," a formula fixed in heaven and proclaimed in the Bible, instead of being the personal experience of God's redemptive purpose and power. In books of this type we have the vain attempt to digest the universe metaphysically. They are the herbariums of religion, where the fragrant flowers of faith, hope, and love which have grown in the soul of man under the gracious nurture of God are exhibited as desiccated dogmas or as philosophical speculations. There are also books galore on religion, bearing testimony to the grace and truth of God in the experience of living men. Like the gospels themselves, such books are a noble proof of the reality and vitality of religion. They contain no theology. They know no problems. They do not argue or defend or explain. They affirm and proclaim great experiences in sermons, confessions, and meditations. They are the real source-books of religion, of which there can never be too many.

But there is need also, in every age, of books in which these two interests are properly blended. And never was that need more imperious than to-day, in the presence of widespread confusion between theology and religion. Multitudes of devout men, in the name of their religion, proclaim and defend a theology of whose historical making and meaning they seem to possess no knowledge whatsoever. Other multitudes, in the name of progress, deny and discard ancient Christian confessions of whose profound and abiding religious significance they have not the slightest inkling. Thus, because of a lack of scientific knowledge on the one hand or of spiritual insight on the other, it comes to pass that the friends of God bury the gospel of his Son in dogmatic graveclothes, while the friends of man

barricade the only road that leads to real progress by refusing to acknowledge Christ as their Lord. We need men who can make the devout more intelligent; and the intelligent, more devout. We need books to convince the Church that her faith in the Savior is a vital experience, rooted in history and repeated in all subsequent ages, and not a dogma about the person and work of Christ. We need books to convince the world that the great confessions of the Church are not the crude superstitions of ages of credulity nor the empty speculations of theologians, but the interpretations of great experiences. Their outward forms are earthen and must ever be renewed, but they enshrine facts that are the eternal verities.

Such a book Professor Richards has given us, the happy product of a heart that knows Christ and of a mind that understands history. Every page of his substantial volume bears the marks of careful and mature scholarship. He has read widely in varied fields of knowledge. Thoroughly at home in the intricate domains of history and theology, where men have toiled for ages, he is familiar, also, with the processes and results of the more recent sciences, such as the History of Religion, the Psychology of Religion, and the Philosophy of Religion. The mere mention of these topics, old and new, each of which has an important bearing on the study of religion, suggests that it is by no means an easy matter to acquire a competent opinion or form an authoritative judgment on the scientific aspects of religion. It requires wide reading, careful study, and earnest thought carried through many years. Even the most versatile genius could not become the master of all the branches of learning embraced by the science of theology, but, certainly, no one should rashly venture to criticize or condemn the results of scholarship unless he, too, has paid the price of laborious research that entitles him to a voice and to a vote. That fact should give pause to facile tongues and ready pens that attempt to settle scientific issues in theology by the methods

of debate and with the arts of oratory. A book like Professor Richards' must needs disturb inherited opinions and destroy cherished traditions. His own convictions may, indeed, be erroneous. He does not invest them with sacrosanct authority. He presents his findings as the result of careful and competent investigation of facts, and he claims for them the authority of history. As such, their true value cannot be established by theological debate or by pompous ecclesiastical declarations against "science, falsely so-called." The only effective weapons against inconvenient facts are better facts and more, and the only armory where these true weapons of our theological warfare may be found is God's universe, from the soul of man with its hidden treasures of moral and spiritual wisdom, to the utmost frontiers of space and time whose secrets science is gradually disclosing. King Canute was no more foolish, when he tried to stem the rising tide of the ocean, than are Christian men who hurl their impotent anathemas against the ever-swelling stream of historical and scientific fact. Nor does our Christian faith call for such Quixotic chivalry from any of its champions. It rests secure on its own foundations, which are in God. No scientific facts can disturb its serenity or destroy its confidence.

That, also, is clearly revealed in the book under review. It is the work of a Christian scholar who has found, in Jesus Christ, a revelation of the supreme fact of the universe, which is the redemptive power and purpose of God. Every line of it glows with the light and warmth of his intelligent faith. History and revelation, reason and religion, fact and faith are seen in their organic relation. There is no conflict between them, except that which is precipitated by the folly of men. They are not even antithetic. Their true relation is complementary. By means of historical research and scientific investigation man finds the facts of the universe, both of the outer world and of his inner life. But the ultimate meaning of these facts the historian can never

discover nor the scientist reveal. That is the function of faith. Science may tell us how the world was made, but no telescope can show us the creator and no microscope can disclose his creative purpose. History may show us the humble beginnings of religion in the soil of human experience, and its growth through the ages, but only faith tastes its objective reality and knows its divine power. It is such genuine faith in the supremacy of Christ, not mere belief of dogmatic theories about him but a personal experience of his redemptive power, sure of itself and secure in its convictions, that enables the author of our book, with perfect freedom and fearless candor, to accept the facts of history and science, and to find in them all, not a refutation but the confirmation of his faith in the Christian God, whose fullness of grace and truth Christ has revealed. And it is this rare fusion of spiritual insight with scientific and historical knowledge that makes the book an important contribution to our theological literature.

If, from this general characterization of the volume, we pass to its contents, we find that about half of it was presented in a course of six lectures before the faculty and students of Auburn Theological Seminary, Easter week, 1922. These lectures, with material enlargements and three added chapters, are now given a wider publicity in the printed volume. In his preface, the author states his purpose in the following words, "I tried to set forth the ideals and principles which control the process of salvation, as that is conceived of by the various Pagan and Christian groups. The foremost questions are:—Whence does salvation come? How is it given? How is it appropriated? How is it expressed in doctrine, institutions, and deed?" In other words, his aim was to deal with salvation as an organic fact in the historical life of our race, with its origin, nature, and expression. Instead of discussing theories of the atonement or evangelistic methods, he takes us into the arena of life, and shows us how, from the beginning to the present, men

have sought and found salvation; and how that eternal quest has been the formative principle of doctrine, cultus, and conduct. The author explicitly affirms his conviction "that the answers to these questions determine the conceptions of God, of Christ, and of the Christian life: in other words, changes in soteriology require corresponding modifications in theology, christology, and ethics; yes, also, in the spirit and form of worship, in the mode of government and discipline and in the motives and manner of Christian living. Indeed, the different Christian churches have arisen because the founder of each was convinced that he had discovered a way of salvation truer to the way of Jesus and the apostles than the way of any of the existing churches" (pp. vii, viii). The reviewer finds himself in hearty sympathy with the avowed purpose of the author, and in full accord with his expressed conviction. The very essence of religion is, indeed, salvation in its widest sense as deliverance from evil and as the achievement of the supreme good. The history of religion is the story of this double quest of man, running its progressive course from prehistoric beginnings, through many cycles, to its culmination in Christ. At first, both the evil which man feared and the good which he craved were conceived in material terms. And his gods were mysterious forces or arbitrary beings that could either hinder or help his quest of salvation. His religion, accordingly, consisted of practices designed to win the favor of benevolent deities and to ward off the harm of malevolent powers. Thus, even on the most primitive levels of life, we find that the quest of salvation, its ideals and principles, are the controlling factor in religion, determining every phase and form of its apprehension and expression. The same thing holds true on every subsequent level. Gradually, man's conception of salvation undergoes significant changes. It is deepened and widened. It becomes spiritual and social. The evil from which he seeks deliverance is sin, radical and racial; and the summum bonum for which he yearns is not

goods but the supreme good, God—reconciliation and communion with God in a fellowship embracing all mankind and enduring forever. And every change in the historic process of salvation, as an ever-widening and deepening human experience, leads to corresponding changes in the theory and practice of religion. Mana and the naturalistic gods of animism and polytheism are discarded. Henotheism becomes monotheism. And monotheism is ethicized and spiritualized. Similar transformations mark the ideals and principles of the expressions of religion in worship and work. When salvation is sought from sin, and when the saving God is conceived as Holy Love, then, obviously, all external mediators and mediations are doomed. Rites and ceremonies, sacramental acts and legalistic merit lose their redemptive significance when men realize that their supreme need is deliverance from the power and guilt of sin by reconciliation with the God of Holy Love. Until at last, in the fulness of time, there came one whose name was called Jesus because he saved men from their sin. He saved men because through him, by repentance and faith, they had access to the Father, whose infinite grace was their salvation.

In his opening chapters Professor Richards gives us a comprehensive sketch of this process of salvation, as a human experience grounded in the nature of man and in the constitution of the universe, and running through history to the Christian era. These two chapters are entitled, respectively, *The Quest for Salvation and Amelioration and Redemption*. They form merely the background of the main body of his discussion; and, traversing vast fields of time and vast spheres of life and thought, they make no pretense of being complete statements. Nevertheless, they contain a clear account of the psychological and historical origin of religion. Its very brevity, and the absence of technical details, will prove a help, rather than a hindrance, to the average reader. There are details concerning which some specialists will disagree with Professor Richards, as, e.g., his

conception of the most elemental factors in religion in terms of a mystery and an emotion (p. 4) ; or his view of magic, "which operates mediately or immediately" (p. 22). But, in the main, his sketch of the genesis of religion is accurate and lucid and it illustrates and confirms the author's main thesis that "a religion is moulded by its idea of salvation."

It is a conjectural reconstruction of a process shrouded in the mist of prehistoric ages, and, therefore, subject always to amendment. But its general accuracy and trustworthiness can hardly be doubted because it rests on the facts of history and psychology.

In the second chapter, *Amelioration and Redemption*, the author turns from the primitive stages of religion "to the more highly developed religions or philosophies of the Hindus and the Greeks." The intervening ages, marking the gradual transition of religion from a blend of superstition and magic to a faith that has clearly recognizable intellectual, volitional, and emotional factors, do not fall within the scope of the book. Redemptive religions begin only when the human consciousness has reached a certain maturity. That occurred in India and Greece, long before the birth of Christ. Accordingly, in these lands we may find pre-Christian ways of salvation, viz., the philosophy of the Vedanta, the religious philosophy of Buddha, and the religions and philosophies of Greece (*Olympic, Orphic, Platonic*). They are graphically pictured and described in the pages of our book. We discern the rise of two distinct tendencies in the sphere of religion that have remained permanent in the life of the race, manifesting themselves ever anew in changing forms. They are the godward and the manward tendencies. Both are directed toward salvation; and each, in its own way, is redemptive. Yet, they differ widely in premise, purpose, and power. The one seeks salvation by a divine act; the other, through human effort. Frequently the two intermingle and lead to (what the theologians have called) "*Synergism*." But, working out their inherent logic, they tend apart and

result in mutually exclusive systems of salvation. The godward tendency leads, finally, to systems in which redemption is a kind of divine legerdemain performed by a metaphysical deity in, or upon, a man. The manward tendency finds its full expression in humanism and moralism. Thus, man is excluded in the one system; and God, in the other. In the mystery cults god descends into man and deifies him. In moralism man seeks to rise, unaided, to divine heights of perfection. He deifies himself. Both of these tendencies were prevalent in the world when Jesus came. Each had its adherents, and its distinctive cult. But never, in any pre-Christian way of salvation, had the two factors, God and man, been brought into an organic relation in the work of redemption. Yet, their very persistence through long ages of deepening experience and ripening thought would seem to suggest that both have their basis in ultimate reality; and that in some sense, therefore, redemption is both a divine gift and a human task. These two factors are not necessarily coördinate, but they certainly are correlative. A summary statement of the outcome of the development of religion "from animism to Platonism" may be found at the close of the second chapter (p. 53).

These opening chapters are interesting in themselves, as vivid portrayals of the earliest scenes of the epic yearning and struggle of man for salvation. They are important, also, because, directly or by implication, they reveal the premises and principles that underlie the structure of the entire book. Without apology, the author accepts the principles and appropriates the assured results of the genetic method. Evidently he feels that the time is at hand when evolution, in the broad sense, is no longer on the defensive. It is still spoken against, but the silent pressure of incontrovertible fact is irresistible. Soon the opposition will be the dim echo of a past that is dead. To be sure there can be no compromise between the champions of the dogmatic method and those who accept the genetic. Dogmatists who regard

religion as an exotic, transported and transplanted from another world, must needs reject a book that describes religion, as indigenous to our world, in terms of a "thrill." Theologians who believe that God equipped the first man with a full system of doctrines and a finished set of precepts must needs demur to a description of the primeval apprehension of God in terms of a "mystery." The dogmatic theologian and the genetic theologian live in different worlds of thought. Either of the two may be right, but they cannot both be right. And there is no use whatever to debate their divergent conclusions. The fundamental cleavage arises in their premises.

But one thing, at least, the most conservative theologian might learn from Professor Richards' book. However far Christian thinkers may differ in premise and principle, they cannot disagree on the one thing that matters supremely: In the beginning, God! The one may find God enthroned in the distant heaven, stooping to create, to reveal, to redeem. The other may find him in his heart, in history, yea in nature, as the Eternal Spirit who is the source of all life and truth. Both will find him fully in Christ, as the Father by whose grace we are saved from sin. That is, or should be, the one distinctive mark of a Christian thinker. And it may be found from cover to cover in the book under review. Though it views religion as grounded deeply in the psychology of man and in the history of the race, it does not reduce it to a human fabric or to a figment of the brain. Whether in the soul of man or in the soil of history, God is the author and the finisher of faith. His very existence conditions the genesis of religion, and his constant activity, in creation, revelation, and redemption, is the dynamic of its growth. To affirm, therefore, that a book like this denies "the supernatural," and reduces religion to pure naturalism is unfair and false. It may, indeed, necessitate a revision of our conception and definition of the supernatural, but it magnifies and glorifies the

God who has revealed himself in Jesus Christ. And that is true Christian supernaturalism.

The main body of the book bears the sub-title, *Christian Ways of Salvation*. It consists of eight chapters entitled, respectively, *The Way of Jesus*; *The Ways of the Apostles*; *The Ancient Catholic Way*; *The Orthodox Catholic Way*; *The Roman Catholic Way*; *The Evangelical Ways—Luther—The Lutheran Way*; *The Evangelical Ways—Zwingli and Calvin—The Reformed Way*; *The Way of the Humanists*. Here we have, first, a *Leitmotif*: *The Way of Jesus*! And then, in their chronological order, the seven great modulations of it that have been intoned in the ages of Christian history. Or, changing the figure, the book presents an historical view of the founder of Christianity, and of its essence, and an illuminating analysis of the successive interpretations of Christ and his gospel, from the apostolic age to our times.

In this section of the book, the author is on his native heath, as a teacher of Church History. He reveals a wide and thorough knowledge of historical facts and relations, a keen discrimination in the midst of bewildering details, and, withal, a fine spiritual insight into the inner meaning of that process of becoming that has its historical source in Jesus Christ and its goal in the bosom of futurity. That process, in its past courses and present tendencies, is so complex that no man is the master of every phase of it. But few men, we venture to affirm, are better qualified than Professor Richards to interpret it as a whole. He knows the sources of our knowledge of Church History. He possesses that imaginative faculty without which the historian remains merely an annalist. And he has a knowledge of Christ, both historical and personal, that serves as a sure criterion in all his critical and constructive work. We imagine that no man can read this section without finding in it something new and true. And we are persuaded that there are many who need to find the truths about Christianity, and its fate

and fortune in the past and present, which Professor Richards has transcribed from the records of history into the pages of his book.

The author writes, primarily, as an historian, and not as a theologian. But the two interests are inseparably intertwined. Theologies are the product of history. They are the crystallization of the dominant ideas and ideals of any given age. And their central point is the idea of salvation. But back of every theology lies the life which it seeks to explain. Thus every idea of salvation is grounded in the religious experience of living men. That is true of Christian conceptions of salvation, no less than of primitive and pagan ideas.

Hence, when we examine *The Way of Jesus*, as set forth in this volume, we read nothing about dogmatic formulas, sacramental rites, or legal ceremonies. The Christian way of salvation appeared in history in the form of a life which was the gift of God. The historical antecedents of Jesus are found in Israel, but the ultimate secret of his redemptive personality must be sought in God. The Father dwelt in him, full of grace and truth. And it was their vision of this God in the face of Jesus Christ that saved men from their sin. In living fellowship with the Master, through repentance and faith, they experienced the power of God's redemptive love. It was an experience that, at the beginning, required no definitions and no explanation. It authenticated itself in the transformed lives of those who, through Christ, had found access to God. Professor Richards says, "This is, doubtless, the supreme mystery of history, the perpetual miracle baffling the mind of man. Yet it is, at the same time, an undeniable fact of human experience, and has been a force in human life that has worked for good far exceeding the reach of the human imagination" (p. 82). One may disagree with his interpretation of the baptism of Jesus, as being the birth of his full messianic self-consciousness (p. 70), but there can be

no dissent from the sober and significant words quoted. It is the judgment of history and the verdict of faith. And is the humble confession that in the person of Jesus we face an historical reality that is deeper than our logic and higher than our thought.

Thus the book presents Christ as the one in whom man's age-long quest for salvation found its ultimate satisfaction, because he reconciled man with God; the sinful child with the gracious Father, in whom he found forgiveness of sin and endowment with power. This redemption is personal and social, present and future, spiritual and moral. It is both a gift and an achievement; a treasure which a man finds and a task which he must perform. But in its essence it is ever the same. Jesus' way of salvation from sin is a new fellowship with the Father in whom sinners find forgiveness and the abundant life. And this generic Christian experience has persisted through all subsequent ages, true to its original type. The historical Christ has become the creative head of a new humanity, redeemed and regenerate. That explains the origin of the Church. It arose on the foundation of the Christian experience. It consisted of persons who shared the experience of redemption through Christ and by faith in the grace of God, and who sought to practice and propagate it. And through all the changing theologies and politics of the Church, in its historical development, one may trace the vital continuity of this fundamental experience. That alone explains the vitality of the Christian religion, its continued existence in hostile environments, and its steady expansion in spite of opposition and competition from without, and in spite of a far more subtle menace from within the Church. Professor Richards makes it very clear that, in every age, the Church had to strive against these destroyers of the Christian faith who were members of her own household—mistaken friends, more dangerous than unmasked foes. In one way or another, they jeopardized the generic experience that in Christ men had found God Him-

self as their Savior. But they remained ever a minor faction, whether Arians, Pelagians, or Socinians. The dominant majority continued triumphantly to confess its faith in a Christ who was the gift of God's love for the redemption of mankind from sin. Even so to-day, there is but one essential Christianity. It is the experience of redemption by the grace of God who manifested His power and purpose in Jesus Christ. It may, indeed, be found in every denomination and sect, beneath all alien accretions and behind all disguises. It is "the one thing that ought to bind Christians of all churches into a common fellowship" (p. viii), even as it is the only power that will win the world for Christ.

In these summary statements I have sought to express the spirit and intent of Professor Richards' detailed discussions, running through the main part of his book. When he passes to *The Ways of the Apostles*, he begins to sketch the scenes of a drama that runs on through the ages. In a very real sense, it is the tragedy of Church History, for it means the gradual obscuration of that which was fundamental in Christianity. The gospel is hardened into a dogma; the fellowship of the saved becomes an autocratic institution of salvation; faith is transformed into belief; redemption is turned into mystic transformation. That seems to be the dismal fate of all the great spiritual movements in history. They are born in the spirit and they end in the flesh. In the heart of the founders they are purely spiritual. But, in order to live, the spirit must express itself in outward forms. Then the forms become static and crush the spirit. Christianity did not escape that fate. It was an imperative of history that it must find expression and interpretation, but it is a tragic tale none the less.

Gradually many nations came to walk in the way of Jesus, Jews and Gentiles. Each came with its own racial genius and national heritage. They all remained passion-

ately loyal to Christ, in purpose and in principle, but they obscured him in the meshes of their theologies and they bound him in the fetters of their sacramental and penitential systems. Thus Christ suffered many ecclesiastical incarnations, and each one was a limitation of his redemptive significance. The process runs on, through many changing forms, from Paul to the rise of the Roman hierarchy. Then, indeed, it appeared as though the spirit of Christianity had been utterly crushed by the weight of that marvellous institution. But the spirit of Christ is deathless. It rose in violent protest in the time of the Reformation, and manifested its redemptive and creative power in the lives of men and in the history of nations.

It is impossible, in these notes, to accompany Professor Richards step by step, as he leads us over the tortuous "subways" of salvation on which men have followed the Christ from afar.

Many scholars have labored to unearth the materials that have gone into the making of these ways, apostolic and catholic. Strange they are, and sometimes baffling in their nature. They came from the hills of Judah, from the cloudland of Greek speculation, from the dark quarries of Oriental mysteries, from the Roman forum. But, in general, the process of using these foreign materials in the making of Christian ways of salvation is well understood to-day. In its main features, it cannot be questioned by men who accept the evidence of historical facts. Professor Richards does not claim to have found new facts. But it would be difficult to mention a book in which these acknowledged facts are assembled so fully, stated so clearly, and interpreted so luminously. Incidentally, laymen of the Reformed Church will owe a special debt of gratitude to the author because he shows them clearly the distinctive difference between the Lutheran and Reformed way of salvation. The delightful question: Reformed what? may still be asked, but it should now receive an intelligent answer.

In his chapters on the Reformation, Professor Richards is at his best. The reviewer is content to point them out for their special excellence, both in content and form. They should be read and studied carefully. The author understands the inmost spirit of that great movement. He understands it so thoroughly that he vastly prefers its spirit to the body which it shaped for itself. He has no hesitancy to place Luther the prophet into the glorious company of the apostles, but neither does he falter in his just criticism of Luther the theologian and ecclesiast. In principle the Reformation was a repetition of the generic Christian experience of salvation by faith in the grace of God. "Luther rediscovered God in Christ,—the God of grace who is ready to forgive freely without merit and works" (p. 182). If we want a fine Christian estimate of the true glory of the Reformers, not foolish adulation but critical appreciation, we may find it in the contrast between *The Evangelical Ways* and *The Way of the Catholics and Humanists*, as portrayed in our book. But if we want to form a fair historical opinion of the incompleteness of the Reformation, we must test *The Evangelical Ways* by *The Way of Jesus*. The Reformation is an arrested movement. Its great formative principle contains within itself the seed of a new world, but its implications and applications to God and man, to life in all its reaches, have never yet been expressed, whether in creed or deed or cultus, by any of the Evangelical churches.

Thus we come to the close of the book, the third part, entitled *Conclusions*. It consists of three chapters. Two are devoted to *Conclusions*, and the final chapter bears the heading, *A Credible Creed*.

Here the author faces the new world, with candor and courage,—the world of science, democracy, and industrialism. He analyzes the dominant spirit of this new age,—its abounding faith in man, its complacent satisfaction with scientific and industrial achievements, and, withal, its moral

impotence and spiritual despair, accentuated and aggravated by the war. There is a summum bonum of life that man needs and seeks, but has not found. "A spark disturbs his clod." From the primeval savage to the modern sage, man has sought the abundant life, salvation and satisfaction. And all types of seekers are with us still: savages and sages, mystics and materialists, epicures and educators, socialists and scientists; each groping blindly for a way of salvation.

In the midst of this modern world Professor Richards sees the majestic figure of Christ, the Savior of mankind. His way is the only way of salvation. What, then, are the churches of Christ doing to show mankind this way to God, to pardon, peace, and power? The author finds that "the Evangelical Churches of the United States are still largely bound by the confessional orthodoxy and the ecclesiasticism of the seventeenth century. Ever and anon there are discouraging evidences of an almost hopeless reaction to an unethical, and, above all, an unnecessary, bibliolatry and confessionalism. Nothing is quite so sad as the premilenarian propaganda and the quadrilateral of the fundamentalists. The inerrant Bible, the Deity of Christ, the Blood Atonement, and the imminency of the personal visible return of Christ are made the substance of the gospel. What a hopeless confusion of gospel and dogma! What a burdening of an intelligent Christian conscience with things which may all be true, but which do not enter vitally into the saving experience of Jesus Christ" (p. 216). The reviewer can merely underscore every word of this sad and solemn indictment of our Protestant scholasticism. And he agrees fully with the following conclusions of the author: "While this condition prevails, to talk of church union is a mere waste of words; to attempt to reconcile Christianity and modern culture is a futile task. To expect to keep the rising generations, who are taught the results of science and trained to think of the universe in a scien-

tific way, true to outworn traditions of the Church, is to ignore the requirements of reason and conscience. Clearly there is a great task before the Protestant ministers and teachers. That task is to show men the Evangelical way of salvation" (p. 220).

One of the excellent features of the author's *Conclusions* is found in chapter twelve, where he considers, in some detail, the evangelical way of salvation in its relation to the Bible; to creeds, confessions, and theologies; to ecclesiastical ordinances and rites; to the scientific view of the world; and to the divisions in the church. Here speaks the faith of a man whom Christ has made free from all the ordinances of men, and bound to the redemptive love of God. Freed men, everywhere, will rejoice with him in his freedom. For others, perchance, his book may be the means of leading them from bondage to the letter into the liberty of the sons of God.

The last chapter of the book contains a tentative confession of faith, submitted to the General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland. Under the caption, *A Credible Creed*, Professor Richards publishes these articles of faith, together with his analysis of them, "Since this document seems to the writer to express, more satisfactorily than any formula he has met, in confessional form the content of the gospel interpreted in the light of the experience of salvation" (p. 296). This explanatory statement the reviewer endorses, unqualifiedly. This tentative confession is more satisfactory than other creeds known to him; less metaphysical and theological and more spiritual and religious. It is tenable, credible, and intelligible in the light of the Christian experience. And, therefore, we welcome it heartily. But even this nobler creed speaks to us, in mingled voices, of the generic Christian experience of salvation. The reviewer, at least, feels that in its twelve articles echoes of Rome and Greece are heard, together with the glad song of salvation. But out of efforts such as this

the creed of Christendom will come, shorter and simpler and more evangelical, which shall be truly ecumenical because it expresses the universal and eternal experience of redemption by the grace of God.

One closes Professor Richards' book in a mixed mood. Joy is uppermost, because of the confirmation of one's faith in the majesty of Christ and in the redemptive power which he has revealed to men. Gratitude goes out to the author for the splendid service his book will render the faith and the cause. And earnest questions arise whether, indeed, as some affirm, organized Christianity must die in order that Christ may live in the heart of mankind; or whether a greater than Luther will come to write the message of this book into the heart of the churches. Certainly, Professor Richards' volume should be read and studied by every minister and officer of our Reformed Church. It may not settle every difference of opinion that exists among brethren of the same household of faith, concerning matters theological, but it will surely unite them all more firmly in the fellowship of their common faith and for the furtherance of their great task. And it should convince open-minded men in every communion that one may be a loyal Christian without repudiating science and philosophy; and a cultured gentleman, without ceasing to be a humble follower of the Nazarene. To be Christian does not necessarily imply that one must be medieval; to be modern does not make one pagan. A Christian is a man who walks in Jesus' way of salvation. Those who have not found that way are not Christians, whatever their culture or character may be.

LANCASTER, PA.